



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HN 1V6A 2

HANDBOOK OF GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE



Digitized by Google

D. CADY EATON



1' 243

HAND-BOOK
OF
GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE

BY
D. CADY EATON, M.A.
(Formerly Professor of the History of Art in Yale College)

PRINCIPALLY FROM THE "BAUSTEINE" OF DR. CARL FRIEDERICHs,
LATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED AND REVISED



BOSTON
JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY
1884

KD28150



Copyright, 1881, 1883, and 1884

By D. CADY EATON

PRESS OF ROCKWELL AND CHURCHILL

39 ARCH STREET, BOSTON

AMONG the art-writers of Germany no one deserves a higher place than Carl Friederichs, late professor of the History of the Fine Arts in the University of Berlin, and assistant director of the Berlin Museum. His untimely death is an irreparable loss to scholarship and to art. Friederichs, better than any other writer, hit the happy mean between prolixity and barrenness. His descriptions are satisfactory and do not fatigue. Moreover his mind was so well-balanced, and his disposition was so modest, that his writings are free from controversy and egotism. His statements are always calm because he loved art better than his own opinions of it.

Friederichs' *Bausteine* is but a collection of simple descriptions of the plaster casts in the Berlin Museum, yet there is no book so good to be placed in the hands of the young student of Greek sculpture. The descriptions are arranged chronologically, divided into art-periods, each period introduced by a short statement of its characteristics.

As the Berlin Museum contains casts of all well-known ancient statues the *Bausteine* starts at the beginnings of Greek sculpture, gradually unfolds the principles that led to its perfect development, and follows it through degeneracy to its end.

I have undertaken to translate and edit selections from the *Bausteine* to meet the taste that is happily beginning to show itself in this country. My book may serve as

a catalogue where casts are already collected ; it may also serve as a guide to societies interested in forming collections, for in selecting I have sought for the most typical examples.

A few descriptions are taken from other sources. Of these the majority relate to works discovered, or investigated, since the *Bausteine* was published.

It is evident that the descriptions should be read in the presence of the objects, or of good representations of them ; casts or photographs, for instance. The ordinary cuts with which books on art are ordinarily illustrated may serve for purposes of recognition, but they are so misleading and hurtful that I do not recommend their use. It is further evident that if the art-student would derive all possible benefit from this work he will study the statues in their chronological order.

I take great pleasure in thus publicly thanking Mr. Alfred L. Ripley, of the Yale faculty, for his kind, valuable, and indispensable assistance in preparing this edition for the press.

It is a happy thing that Greek sculpture is beginning to receive deserved attention in this country ; for there is no better assured process for purifying taste than that offered by its study.

D. CADY EATON.

N. B. I shall throughout use Latin mythological names because they are more generally known than the Greek.

ARCHAIC AND IMITATIVE ARCHAIC ART.

No national Art appears in Greece before the seventh century B.C., and during that century the beginnings only of art are traceable. The doll-like, formless, wooden, images of the gods which stood in Greek temples previous to the seventh century B.C. were undoubtedly of Greek workmanship; but all artistic objects, whether of bronze or of stone, were of foreign manufacture or copied from foreign models.

The earliest art notions came to Greece from the East: to these were subsequently added influences from Egypt.¹

To the period anterior to the beginnings of Greek sculpture, as at present understood, belongs the relief of the

LIONS OF MYCENA.

This work is of hard yellowish-gray limestone, and still occupies its original position over the chief gate of the walls of Mycena. The triangular, gable-like form of the relief was necessitated by the shape of the place to be occupied. In early times, in order to remove weight from the lintel, the first layer of stone-work above it was not carried entirely across the lintel; the second overlapped the first on either side, the third the second, and so on till a continuous layer was reached; the result being a triangular opening, of which the sides

¹ It is an open question whether the first art-notions came to Greece from Asia or from Egypt.

resembled inverted stairs. When the wall was completed, the opening was covered with a light slab, at times ornamented with reliefs, as it is here. The singular column between the two animals probably bore on its top an object which, if preserved, would have completed and explained the symbolism. The animals, judging from the manes and tails, were intended to be lions. The whole relief, in accordance with early practice, was undoubtedly colored; so that details were distinct and easily recognized. The heads, which were separate pieces skilfully inserted, projected boldly; the glance directed against any one approaching the door-way.

The intention may have been to symbolize a careful watch and vigilant guardianship of the city, or the whole scene may have been of the nature of a coat-of-arms. The later view is strengthened by the fact that the hind feet of the animals, as in modern heraldry, do not rest upon anything in particular. The form of the lions is fairly suggestive of nature, but too slight.

Ancient tradition assigns this work to the Cyclops, a fabled race who, wandering from Lycia in Asia Minor into the South of Greece, there left specimens of the massive masonry which, after them, is called Cyclopean. If the tradition be accepted, the work belongs to a period anterior to the beginnings of Greek sculpture; for writers unite in placing the time of the Cyclops before that of Homer, though they differ as to the precise century. In technique the work differs from anything known to be of Greek origin.

ARCHAIC ART.

In the seventh century B.C. are seen the beginnings of a national art. Foreign influences are still felt, but specific Greek characteristics are recognized. Though there is evidence of the existence at the beginning of this period of but two schools of art—the Athenian and

the school of Ægina—it cannot be doubted that there were other centres of art-activity where peculiar characteristics were developed. It is not yet possible to assign the works of the first period of Greek sculpture to specific schools; though, as the period progresses, Attic art may be distinguished from Lycian, Spartan from Sicilian, and Corinthian from that of Ægina. The period may be regarded as embracing more than two centuries. In the middle of the fifth century its characteristics may be still recognized. The period, therefore, may be divided into two parts; the first part including the seventh and sixth centuries, the second the first half of the fifth century. Of the art-activities of the second part numerous and important specimens have been preserved.

WORKS OF THE SEVENTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES.

THE APOLLO OF THERA, AND THE APOLLO OF TENEA.

1. The first statue was found in 1830 on the island of Thera (Santorin) and is now in the New Museum at Athens. The head, a piece by itself, is connected with the trunk by an iron peg. The second statue was found in 1846 on the site of the Corinthian village of Tenea and is now in the Glyptothek of Munich. It was found broken, but all the pieces were recovered.

Each figure presents the same type, but in different degrees of technical excellence. The Theraic is far coarser and stouter, especially about the breast. In the back anatomical details are but faintly expressed. The figure is an interesting example of the manner in which

art begins with the mere outline of form before proceeding to a rendering of detail.

In the Munich figure the execution is stiff and spare. Especially noticeable is the rigidity of the muscles, shown, for instance, in the updrawing of the knee-pan. The stiffened arms and the clenched hands accord with the straightened position of the legs. Easy attitudes are not to be found in this style. The figures are standing, not walking. The graceful pose of later times, where the weight of the body rests on one leg, and the other, unburdened and gently bent, but touches the ground, is unknown. In the old style both legs bear up the body equally, and the feet rest squarely on the ground. Noticeable in these statues are the plane surfaces of the old style, before the imitation of nature led to modelling; for instance, the sides of the hips and of the heels.

The heads are straight on the shoulders; the severity of the old style permitted no turning. The forehead retreats, the nose projects. Features were not executed with a close regard for nature till art occupied itself with expression. In the earliest works the mouth is tightly shut to correspond with the stiff character of the style; later, it is slightly opened. A universal characteristic of the old style is the smile. Gods and men, the living and the dying, all smile. This smile is the beginning of the representation of the life of the soul, and is the effort of early art to express heartiness, affability, pleasantness. The dimple, seen in the chin of the Munich figure, and which often appears in the style, is an evidence of similar effort. The head of the Theraic Apollo, with its hooked nose and oblique eyes, is decidedly foreign. The hair of each figure and the encircling fillets were undoubtedly colored. The hair of the Tenean Apollo is only indicated by rough rolls above the forehead, and by horizontal divisions behind where it falls on the shoulders. Of the Theraic, the locks on the forehead are partially worked out, and the falling locks behind are indicated. In each

figure the intention was to impart by waving hair an appearance of life and motion. The little locks about the forehead of the Theraic Apollo are suggestions from life, though the artist did not yet venture to imitate with freedom. The statues in all probability represent Apollo. Pausanias (viii. 40, 1) describes an archaic statue of an athlete represented in a similar position; but in the earliest times art did not recognize the necessity of representing each character by a special pose, for instance, but made use of the same type for different purposes. From the beginnings of art Apollo has been generally represented as the poets describe him,—a beardless youth, with long waving hair. As an athlete would have worn his hair cropped, one is not here represented.¹ The number of similar figures found points to the representation of a divinity; the long hair and beardless face limit the selection to Apollo.

In each statue are indications of the influence of Egyptian art upon the early Grecian; the unnaturally high position of the ears of the Theraic Apollo, for instance. This peculiarity is seen in many early works, and may even be found in the frieze of the Parthenon. The advancing of the left foot,—a peculiarity of all genuine archaic Greek statues,—the arms hanging close to the sides, and the narrowness of the hips in comparison with the breadth of the shoulders, are Egyptian peculiarities which must have been imported; for it is impossible to suppose that that they were for a second time and independently developed in Greece. On the other hand it must not be supposed that these or any other Greek statues were copied from the Egyptian. Not only is nudity an especial Hellenic principle to which the Egyptians were opposed both by custom and by moral intuition, but traits that are essentially Greek are seen in the details of form. Compare an Egyptian foot with a Greek one, for instance. In the former the little toe is

¹ There was no cropping of hair till after the Persian war.

not curved, while the other toes are flattened out, straight, and parallel; as if merely the skeleton plan of nature had been observed. On the other hand, the oldest and rudest Greek statues show a certain regard for nature, and an effort to reproduce the given form.

To ascertain the period of the production of these statues the time of the beginning of Egyptian influence must be sought. No lasting Egyptian influence can have been produced in Greece before citizens of either country could dwell in the other. This, according to Herodotus, was not possible before the time of Psammetichus, in the seventh century. Nor does it appear that before the seventh century statues in stone were executed in Greece. The Apollo of Thera probably belongs to that century. It has, at all events, such a primitive, rude, character that it must belong to the very beginnings of art. The more precise, careful, and finished execution of the Apollo of Tenea would seem to place it in the sixth century, and more likely in the earlier than in the later half of the century.¹

THE FRIEZES OF ASSOS.

2. [A number of friezes discovered amid the ruins of a Doric temple on the site of the ancient city of Assos in the Troad. Most of them were found about the beginning of the present century, were acquired for France in 1838 by Raoul-Rchette, and are now in the Louvre. A few more were discovered in 1881, by an expedition organized by the Archæological Institute of America, and are now in the Art Museum of Boston, U.S.A.]

The friezes are of a brownish-gray granite, are rudely carved, and have suffered from the ravages of time. As triglyph regulæ appear on the upper edge of some of the slabs it is evident that those particular ones formed part

¹The Apollo of Tenea is No. 41 in Brunn's Catalogue of 1868 of the Glyptothek. The marbles in the New Museum have not yet been catalogued. The Apollo of Tenea looks like an Egyptian statue that has concluded it can walk. It grins with excitement while bracing its muscles for the effort.

of the architrave. The reliefs are carved on the solid blocks of the masonry, and are not on applied slabs as is more frequently the case. In the Boston specimens the entire blocks have been preserved. In the Louvre specimens only so much of the blocks was retained as was necessary to secure the sculpture. No continuity of composition is evident. Nor can it always be determined whether a slab be from the architrave or from a metope. It may be that no continuity of composition existed, and that juxtaposition of unrelated scenes is a characteristic of the early art to which these sculptures are supposed to belong.

Three of the Louvre slabs are regarded by Clarac (*Musée*, II, 1152) as related, and are supposed by him to contain scenes from the episode of Menelaus and Proteus. (*Odyssey*, iv, 440 *et seq.*) First in order Clarac puts a large slab, containing, on the right, Menelaus grasping the body of Proteus, the lower half of which has already turned itself into a fish, and, on the left, nereids and nymphs hurrying away in fright. If the artist were inspired by Homer he was further inspired to take great liberties with the text; for the companions of Menelaus do not appear, and nereids and nymphs have been substituted for the sea-cows. Still there are many things to recall the story. The expression of Proteus is mild, as if his resistance were pretence, and as if in reality he were glad of the opportunity of displaying his prophetic powers. Menelaus not only has his two arms about Proteus, but grasps the two hands of the demi-god as if in the transformations these would be the best points to hold secure. On a broken piece of another slab are two figures reclining at a banquet. The one on the right holds a cup in his left hand, and places his right hand on his heart as if assuring sincerity. This figure Clarac takes to be Proteus, who having finished his transformations and sufficiently tried Menelaus, is now entertaining him as a guest. The other figure is Menelaus: he holds a cup with his left hand, and with his right seems loosening a band from the right arm

of Proteus, as if convinced that no further attempt at escape would be made. On a third broken slab the two are again seen, and again at a banquet. The figure who lifts his eyes and his right hand to heaven Clarac supposes to be Menelaus, thanking the gods for the happy issue of the adventure. On the other Louvre slabs are centaurs, sphinxes, combating bulls, and lions tearing their prey. Clarac's interpretations are not accepted by German critics. They regard the scenes, if individual, as taken from the myths of Hercules.

The most interesting relief recovered in 1881 contains three fleeing centaurs, a pursuing figure with a bow, and a part of a figure back of him raising his left hand and holding in his right a drinking vessel. This is supposed to represent the incident in the life of Hercules when the hospitality of Pholos was interrupted by an inroad of centaurs, some of whom the hero killed while the rest were put to flight. (Papers of the Archæological Institute of America. Classical Series, I, p. 107 *et seq.*)

The centaurs are represented in very archaic form, having the entire human body to which is attached the body and the hind legs of the horse. Here the horse parts appear inert and lifeless. The figure behind the supposed Hercules is but partially preserved. It may be Pholos, his host; or Iolaos, his ordinary companion. The expedition of 1881 secured, also, some slabs containing sphinxes; one of a lion attacking an animal resembling a boar, and a few fragmentary metopes containing, apparently, the fightings of heroes.

These sculptures offer certain interesting peculiarities. The isokephalism is marked. The style is very archaic. Yet the custom of reclining at table is supposed not to have been introduced into the Greek cities of Asia Minor till the time of the Persian war. Moreover the drinking vessels are of late design. For these reasons Clarac doubts the very early origin of the works. German critics, on the other hand, assign them to a remote antiquity. Brunn and Overbeck put them back to the sixth cen-

tury B.C. ; Friederichs still further back, to the seventh. Friederichs maintains that, if later than the seventh, Hercules would have been represented with club and lion's skin. The question is more interesting to the archæologist than to the student of art.

The art student will find the works rude and difficult to be assigned to a place in any orderly art development. But they are full of free composition, and display those quaint and childlike qualities which so frequently characterize early Greek artistic effort. — *Ed.*]

METOPÉ RELIEFS FROM SELINUS.

3. Three reliefs in tufa, found in 1822 by two English architects, Messrs. Harris and Angell, in the ruins of an old Doric temple on the acropolis of Selinus in Sicily. The reliefs are in the museum of Palermo.

The first, put together from thirty-two fragments, represents Perseus in the presence of Minerva, his protecting divinity, decapitating Medusa. Perseus seems to be clad with a skirt only: this skirt, however, may be the end of a close-fitting garment, the upper part of which was indicated by color. The shoes are not winged according to the myth, but are the beaked shoes found in representations of Mercury and of other divinities. On the head is a small cap with a narrow rim, also similar to that worn by Mercury. Medusa, who was probably clothed in a short garment indicated by color, has fallen to her knees. She holds Pegasus, the product of her blood, tenderly in her arms. Pegasus in old art is generally represented as emerging from Medusa's headless neck. The artist has avoided this ugly notion, though he fails to account for the steed's miraculous appearance. Medusa is represented in accordance with the naïve taste of the old style for the horrible. The serpent's locks do not yet appear. They were later additions of the poets Æschylus and Pindar. Minerva remains passive, not because of her divinity, but because

in the old style personages not taking immediate part in the action were represented motionless. Her right hand probably rested on her breast and held a spear. The ægis was indicated by color. Traces of color were found on the background and on various parts of the composition. The eyes and eyebrows of the goddess were black. The eyes of Medusa were red.

The second relief, put together from forty-eight fragments, represents Hercules with the Cercopes. He has caught the irritating and thieving creatures who allowed him no rest, has bound them hand and foot, and carries them slung head downward from a yoke on his shoulders.

The strong stride, the stiffened muscles of the legs, and the unnatural planting of the entire soles of both feet on the ground, are characteristics seen in both painting and sculpture of the old style; for strength and energy were the first considerations. By some of the early art schools of Greece Hercules was represented bearded. Here his face is smooth. His hair, in contrast to that of the Cercopes, is short. He is clad with a short tunic bound about the middle with a girdle. It was undoubtedly relieved with color. His sword hangs horizontally; perhaps to make it plainer, perhaps to properly divide the spaces on each side of his body. The sword-belt, the girdle, and the bands which go about the hands, the feet and the knees of the Cercopes, are marked with red. Their garments are also marked with red about the neck and around the arms. The background was also red; also the ornament on the edge at the top of the relief.

The third relief is put together from fifty-nine pieces. Much is wanting to make the composition clear. The restorers have given the relief the metope shape, and it is probable that it and the others actually filled metopes. As the composition required depth of space, the relief is inclosed in a deeper frame than the others, though the difference may not have been specially noticeable. The style of the execution differs from that of the others, though it is not so superior as to indicate a later period.

The scene is apparently the front view of a four-horse chariot. The outer horses, as frequently happens in the old style, are larger than the inner ones. Of the chariot, the dash-board, the pole, the axle, and the wheels are recognizable. Of the driver, a piece of the head, a small portion of the body just above the chariot, the forearm and the left hand holding the reins leading to the nigh horses, are all that were recovered. The outer horses are slightly in advance of the inner ones, presumably to make room for two female figures in long flowing garments. But very little of these figures remains; enough, however, to indicate that, though on the ground, they stood quite as high as the figure in the chariot. In relief the law was early established that all the heads should be on the same line. Isokephalism, as it is called, remained a rule through the best art periods. On the frieze of the Parthenon the heads of all figures whether, standing, sitting, or riding, are on the same line; the eye taking less offence from such a violation of nature than it would if this artistic line were broken. Another artistic violation of nature is apparent in this relief: the horses are made unnaturally small. Perhaps this was to avoid hiding the figures standing behind them; or it may have been the artist's intention in this way to make the human figures still more conspicuous. Traces of red were found on the chariot, on the harness, and on the background. No attempt can be made to explain the composition.

The style of these works is still very primitive. The figures are not rounded on the sides where they meet the background, and their surfaces are quite flat. It was not till later periods that figures in relief were rounded after the manner of free standing statues. At first, whether in high or in low relief, they were flat; made entirely for the ornamentation of flat surfaces. The influence of the flat surface itself occasioned violations of nature. For instance, in early relief as well as in early painting, the head and legs of a figure are often in profile while the breast is full to the front. The same thing is

seen in Egyptian and Assyrian relief. The object in putting heads and legs in profile was undoubtedly to prevent the projection of noses and feet beyond the surface of the relief; while, on the other hand, if breasts were in profile one shoulder would project. In the reliefs under consideration the heads are to the front, because the reliefs are so high that the proper relations of heads to breasts could be given. The heads being to the front make a livelier impression. Moreover the head of Medusa, which only in late art is given in profile, must be seen in front to produce the intended impress of terror. Surface influence is seen in the position of the right arm of Hercules, also in the heads of the outer horses of the four which are turned to keep them within the line of the heads of the inner horses.

Some peculiarities point to foreign influences. The ears are Egyptian in character. They are too high and do not lie flat to the head, especially the ears of Medusa. On the whole, however, these sculptures bear the impress of a primitive and independent awkwardness. No long practice in art can have preceded them. Originality is seen in the proportions of the figures. Hercules is five heads high; Minerva, four and three-quarters; Perseus, but four and a quarter.

The squatty and compact character of the figures is also a manifestation of independence. The tendency of the style seems to be towards the expression of all possible strength by compactness of build and by great muscular development. The style accords with the heavy character of Selinus architecture, though it must not be regarded as in any way controlled by the architecture, as similar statues are found where architecture could have had no influence. Since modern scholarship has sought out different influences at work at the beginnings of Greek art this style has been called Doric. As the style appears also at Sparta, and as both Sparta and Selinus were Doric, the term is not inappropriate. Nor does the style fail to remind one of the characteristics of

the Doric race. Still it must not be inferred that all Doric artistic activity developed itself in this manner.

The reliefs must be referred to the end of the seventh century B.C., the time of the founding of the city. At least the temple to which they belonged must have been built at the very beginnings of the city; for it is the oldest ruin in Selinus and is on the Acropolis, within whose sacred limits the first stones of the city were laid. The general character of these works is sufficient evidence of their great antiquity. In the figure of Hercules is found special proof of a more precise date, for after the seventh century Hercules always appears with the lion's skin. Two other peculiarities still further attest antiquity: first, that more than two personages appear on a metope and, second, that the metopes differ in subject. In later art but two personages are represented on one metope; and all the metopes that adorn a temple, or are upon one side of it, are apt to agree in subject; as the metopes of the Parthenon, for instance, which give various phases of the combat between the Lapithæ and the Centaurs.

THE RELIEF OF SAMOTHRACE.

4. A small marble fragment found in 1790 on the island of Samothrace, and since 1816 in the Louvre. It has been let into the wall in such a way as to mar the border, which probably represented the scaly neck and open mouth of a horned monster. To what the fragment belonged is not clear. The curved end formed by the monster's breast would seem to indicate that the fragment was part of an ornamentation which perhaps was attached to a chair of state. As the fragment gives but a portion of a scene, which may have occupied considerable space, it is more likely that it is part of a commemorative slab.

The inscriptions make the action clear so far as it is given. Agamemnon sits on a species of camp-stool; behind him stands the herald, Talthybios, with his rod

of office; back of Talthybios is Epeios (of whose name only the first three letters remain), the builder of the wooden horse, who is also in the poem one of Agamemnon's followers. The ceremonial appearance of Agamemnon, with his heralds behind him, would indicate that the whole slab represented a council at which the king of men had pronounced important judgment. The ornament on the upper edge, of palm leaves and blossoms, is often found about the necks of early painted vases. The twisted ornament on the under edge is one that often appears in early Greek, Etruscan, and Indian-art.

The relief is interesting in art-history. Some of the peculiarities of early relief were mentioned in the description of the marbles of Selinus. In early reliefs surfaces are generally flat, but slightly raised from the background, and terminated by square edges. The intention seems to have been to interfere as little as possible with architectural surfaces, and to maintain in the sculpture a strict subordination to architectural principles. In later art a contrary intention is evident. Relief is made round and full, not only from a sense of nature, but to make sculpture stand out from, and be independent of, the architectural background. In early flat relief color was used to distinguish parts and to give them their proper effects. Of the earliest periods reliefs are found so flat as to be absolutely plain surfaces with parts marked off by shallow grooves. The relief in question is but little removed from this style. In reliefs of the best periods of Greek art surfaces are still slightly flattened; the round forms of nature not freely given, but only delicately indicated. In later and Roman work, and in poor work of all periods, this surface principle is neglected; and, though figures may be more true to nature, relief loses its calm and noble expression. Relief should be suggestive, not realistic; parts indicated rather than portrayed. In some early reliefs the indications are insufficient; for instance, in the present relief it does not appear which leg of the herald is in front.

The figures in this relief are thin and small, presenting a strong contrast to the figures on the reliefs from Selinus. At the same time they show but little resemblance to early Attic work. In the arrangement of the hair a resemblance is seen to the Apollo of Tenea. Agamemnon has longer hair, in accordance with his higher rank. Another peculiarity of the old style is seen in the inscriptions which are written in curved lines. Early vases show a similar practice. In early times, before simplicity in art was understood, a vacant space was an offence, and must be filled up with ornamentation or with inscriptions. Personages, too, who had not special attributes to distinguish them, could be known only by inscriptions. The inscriptions on the Samothrace relief are in the old Ionic alphabet. Efforts have been made to fix the date of the relief from the use of the "omega" in the word Agamemnon; but though it is reasonably well established that the "omega" was not used in Athens till the fourth century B.C., it may have been, and probably was, used much earlier in the islands of the *Ægean* and on the Asiatic coast. Judging the relief by its style it can hardly be put later than 500 B.C.

WORKS FROM THE FIRST HALF OF THE FIFTH CENTURY.

Attic Art.

GODDESS STEPPING INTO A CHARIOT.

5. A badly damaged fragment found on the Acropolis at Athens and now in the New Museum in the same city. Another piece, containing tails and hind legs of the horses and a bit of the pole of a chariot, was found subsequently

and on another part of the Acropolis. There can be no doubt, however, that the two belong together.

The question has been raised whether the figure be male or female. The delicate arm and hand indicate a female, and if a female, then a goddess; for an Athenian woman would not have been represented driving a chariot: and if a goddess, probably a wingless victory; as the wingless goddess of victory is often represented guiding her chariot. As similar representations were on the frieze of the cella of the new Parthenon of Pericles it is supposed that this fragment is from the frieze that adorned the old Parthenon destroyed by Xerxes. The fragment is interesting as showing the first beginnings of that delicate artistic treatment which distinguished Attic art.

TOMBSTONE OF ARISTION.

6. A marble bas-relief found in 1838 in Attica; now in the New Museum of Athens.

It still shows traces of color. The background was red, the coat of mail blue with red ornaments, while the flesh was uncolored with the exception of the lips and eyes. The hair and beard also show traces of a dark color. The shoulder-piece was ornamented with a star, and on the breast was an ornament resembling an animal's head. About the breast and waist are bands of ornamentation. The short skirt of the coat of mail is also decorated. There is still left a bit of the fastening by which a metal plume was attached to the helmet. The coat of mail does not take the shape of the body as in Roman statues and in Greek statues of a later date. If at this period coats of mail were shaped to the body the artist would probably have indicated the fact with the same fidelity he has shown in the execution of the greaves. The word Aristion is undoubtedly the name of the deceased. Though executed long anterior to the period of portraiture, and showing no action, the relief is still a characteristic representation of

the departed ; perhaps one of the heroes of Marathon of whom Aristophanes gives such a lively picture, deriding their garments while wondering at their courage. The relief is an admirable explanation of the poet's words. (The Clouds, 984 *et seq.*) The work is finished with the greatest care. If all the details on the coat of mail had their original sharpness and original freshness of color the same style would be recognized which appears on the very best ancient vases. The nude does not show a similar excellence. The feet are rendered with a certain attention to details ; but the hands are not true to nature. The slightly bent and naturally falling right arm is a great advance on the technique seen in the early statues of Apollo. The small space in which the figure is economized is typical of the old style ; also the position of the eye, which is full to the front though the face be in profile. On the pedestal are the words : "The work of Aristokles." This artist was probably a contemporary of Kritios, the artist of the tyrant-killers ; and probably also a contemporary of the artist of the ancient statue of Penelope in the Vatican, where a similar treatment of the hand is to be observed. The relief must be referred to a time between the 70th and 80th Olympiads.

THE NAPLES GRAVESTONE.

7. A marble relief formerly in the Borgia collection at Rome, now in the Naples Museum.

As in the preceding relief, so here, the figure of the deceased is in the narrowest possible space. Instead, however, of being stiff and motionless, the figure shows not only action, but even sentiment ; the sentiment being that subdued sorrow which is the only expression of grief found on tombs of the best period of Greek art. The oil vial hanging from the wrist indicates that the deceased was a gymnast. He rests his shoulder on a long stick in a manner often seen on tombs, especially on those of

Athenian origin. The protuberance on the head is probably the "Krobylos," as the hair was called when brought together and bunched, as was the custom among the early Athenians. The gesture by which the man extends his hand to his faithful dog is an example of the tender sentiment so often seen on Greek tombs. The thumb of the hand is unnaturally bent, probably to keep it from projecting. Still more remarkable is the right leg, of which the foot is in profile, resting on the ground, while the knee and upper part are to the front. A projecting foot would have been true to nature; but nature is sacrificed to the surface principle, a noteworthy instance of the strength of this principle in early art. The early style is manifest in both form and drapery, still the relief can hardly be earlier than the middle of the fifth century; first, because of the improvements manifest over the Aristion relief; and, secondly, from the fact that the ornament on top of the slab resembles ornamentation found on the Parthenon. This resemblance shows, further, that the relief is of Athenian workmanship; a fact suggested by the form of the figure. The ornamentation consists of an upright palm leaf terminating in a point and enclosed between bunched tendrils. Here the palm leaf is flat and severe. Its form, which is but indicated, must have been made more distinct by color. In later art the palm leaf was rounded out, and the tendrils made truer to nature in accordance with the universal art principle of development from the symbolical to the real.

HERCULES AND THE HIND.

8. A marble relief formerly of the Towneley collection, since 1807 in the British Museum, London. The elevated edge and the oblong shape suggest the idea that the relief may have ornamented an altar or the base of a candelabrum.

Hercules, with his left knee on the back of the hind, and holding its horns with his two hands, presses the poor

beast down to the ground with the full force and weight of his muscular body. Its hind legs are already doubled beneath it, and the only front leg in the relief is bent at the knee and no longer supports.

The animal has the appearance of a hind, yet the artist has not hesitated to follow the poet and give it horns; both poet and artist preferring beauty to truthful rendering.

The form of Hercules in this early work is already characteristically developed. Apart from the mighty muscles, the thick neck is an especial trait. The line from the back of the neck to the shoulders is almost straight, — evidence that there is no yielding beneath any and all the burdens placed upon him. The brow is low and very prominent in the lower half; not indicating intelligence, but showing energy and force of will. Long hair would have been too weak and ideal for this hero. The crisp, short, and knotted curls which cover the entire head are in keeping with his stubborn strength.

The relief, though full of character, is not original. A sufficient proof is that the left foot and the calf of the right leg run together without any line of demarcation. That the original was a work of great importance is evident from the numerous adaptations of later art. In these later works there is greater freedom of action and more effective arrangement, but little departure is allowed from the early type. The relief is probably Attic, as Hercules is similarly treated on early Attic vases, while in other localities — Selinus for one — other appearances are given him.¹

HARMODIUS AND ARISTOGEITON.

9. Marble statues formerly belonging to the Farnese

¹ The animal may just as well be the Arcadian stag. The left arm and hand of Hercules do not at all appear. The nose of the animal is this side of the border; while its left leg and part of its breast disappear behind it. These irregularities betray the copyist quite as much as those mentioned by Friederichs.

collection in Rome ; in Naples since 1790. Of the figure which has a garment over the left arm the two arms are modern restorations ; made, however, before the statues were brought to Naples. The restoration is correct with the exception of the sword-hilt in the left hand, which is an addition. To the hilt in the right hand a bronze sword was probably attached. The head is antique but does not belong to the statue, being of a different and far later style. The arms of the other figure are also new, and are correct restorations with the same exception as in the first figure. The right leg from the hip down, and the left leg from the knee down, are also modern. On the breast is still seen the mark left by the bronze strap which supported the scabbard. The restorations, the proper grouping of the figures, and the names of the personages represented have been ascertained from an Athenian bas-relief and from Athenian coins, taken in connection with the statements of classic authors. The figures are copies in marble of a bronze group of Harmodius and Aristogeiton made by Kritios, an elder contemporary of Phidias, and erected near the Propylæa in Athens Ol. 75, 4, to replace an older group of the same subject removed by Xerxes. The action is as follows. The figure with the more modern head had originally, according to the above mentioned bas-relief, a bearded head and, consequently, was Aristogeiton, the elder of the two. This figure stood to the right of the other and a little behind it. The attack is made by Harmodius, the younger, and the one who had been the more directly insulted. He advances to give the blow. The action is restrained, as sculpture had not yet reached the point of giving full expression to passion. Aristogéiton is apparently charged with the defence. He stands by the side of his friend as a second, holding his mantle spread out as a shield. His sword is more for defence than attack. Greater unity is sought to be given to the group by arranging limbs on the principle of contrast. The right leg and arm of one figure correspond to the left leg and

arm of the other. This principle of contrast, which is one of the first elements of grouping, was not understood during the very early style. In it the same postures are repeated; so that figures appear as a row of units in their relations to one another. The placing of one figure slightly in advance of the other also adds to the unity of the group. The position is more free and natural than if the two were placed on a line, as in marching. There results also from this arrangement a contrast and a juxtaposition of lines which are felt to add to the unity of the composition. The supports were, of course, not necessary in the bronze originals.

These works help to explain the terms used by authors in describing the style of Kritios and his contemporaries. It was hard, stiff, and close, without fine undulations, sinewy, and sharp of outline. Examine the right thigh of Aristogeiton, for instance, where the sharpest rendering of the muscles is attempted. Forms so fashioned may have been characteristic of the old Athenians who conquered at Marathon. Perhaps, too, those warriors had faces suggestive of the square-built face of the Harmodius, with its high cheek-bones, its prominent eyes and elongated chin, forming such a contrast to the attractive oval of later times. Kritios who, according to accounts, was one of the foremost artists of his time, seems to have had the same object in view held by his contemporary Myron; namely, to lead sculpture away from the stiffness of the early style by making form and action true to life. In naturalness of movement Kritios is inferior to Myron; but in rendering form he is so excellent that Winckelmann, who saw these statutes before their removal to Naples, considered them among the finest in Rome. The original group must have been one of the earliest historic works executed in Greece. The principle was early recognized of representing historical personages not literally nor in the costume they actually wore, but typically in a manner corresponding to their character: in heroic nudity. One of the strongest principles of Greek sculpture in the

time of its highest development was the generalizing of the individual; the idealizing of the historic.¹

PENELOPE.

10. A marble statue in the Vatican. The part of the veil which is above the head, the nose, the right hand, the right leg from the knee down, and the left foot, are restorations. The rock work, on which the figure sits, is also modern. The figure originally sat on a chair, with its feet on a stool, while under the chair was a work-basket. Such an arrangement occurs in so many old copies of the statue that there can be no doubt that it was the original one.

The name Penelope is correctly assigned. The right hand raised to support the sinking head marks one worn out with care and grief. The, to a woman, unbecoming and inappropriate crossing of the legs carries out the idea of a figure crouching beneath the burden of sorrows. It is the attitude of a person who no longer cares for appearances. The work-basket which exists in many copies, and which must be imagined here, points to a person distinguished for household virtues. These characteristics might not be conclusive; but there exist terracotta reliefs on which a figure, almost identical with this one, occurs with such surroundings as to fix it as a representation of Penelope. These reliefs give the scene of the washing of the feet of Ulysses and his recognition by his old nurse Eurykleia when Penelope, oppressed with heavy thoughts, her mind turned away by Minerva, as Homer puts it, sits by herself unable to notice what is occurring. It is supposed that this figure formed with others a group similar in composition to the reliefs in

¹ Prof. Freiderichs' modesty prevents him from mentioning that it was entirely owing to his own knowledge and ability that these statues were recognized and named. Before 1858, when Freiderichs' attention was attracted to them, they stood apart and separated in the Naples Museum, and were simply labelled as fighting gladiators.

question. This supposition has been strengthened by the finding in Ithaca of a set of small bronze statues which were undoubtedly grouped together and of which one represents Ulysses seated for his foot-bath. These bronzes and the reliefs were undoubtedly suggested by an important early work of which the statue under consideration may have formed a part. In view of the evidence offered by these reliefs and bronzes, the idea that the statue is a sepulchral monument must be abandoned. Representations are frequently found on Greek tombs in which grief is similarly portrayed, but the personality of Penelope is here well established; the work, moreover, is not sufficiently abstract and idealized for sepulchral sculpture. It is evident from the composition that the figure was to be seen from but one side. The group to which it belonged probably ornamented the pediment of a temple. In style it is still very early, though the stiffness of lines has been sensibly lessened. This advance is especially noticeable in the delicate and attractive treatment of drapery. The face is tender and full of character. It has the long narrow form suited to the expression of trouble or longing. The lips are lightly parted in dejection, and the loosely falling locks characterize a troubled spirit by betraying an indifference to appearance.

In contrast to the face the left arm and hand are still very primitive, especially the hand, which is angular and almost without anatomical details. Though in the representation of emotions the artist was quite advanced, in the representation of form he was still under the influence of the early style, — an opposite development to that shown by the statues of Ægina, where form is very true to nature, but where there is no expression of sentiment or emotion.

The statue must be assigned to the school of Attica, and may be referred to the first half of the fifth century, the period of the beginning of the full development of pure Greek art. An artist by the name of Kalamis was famous

in Athens at this time for characteristics which this statue admirably illustrates. He was praised in antiquity for his ability to represent purity, tenderness, sincerity, and that, too, while still adhering to the stiff forms of the early style.

THE VIENNA AMAZON FRAGMENT.

11. [A fragment in the K. K. Münz and Antiken Cabinet at Vienna. The arms, the right leg from the knee down, and the whole of the left leg and hip to the waist, are wanting. A wound in the left breast and the drooping head disclose the situation: the Amazon, mortally wounded, is falling in death. The figure wears an under-garment which entirely covers the breasts and falls to near the knee. Over this an outer garment looped at the right shoulder, and passing under the right breast, falls down the right thigh and conceals the under-garment in front except at the right breast. The difference in texture between the two is admirably rendered. The draping of both breasts is one of the archaisms of the statue.

The figure was probably grouped according to the analogy of a gem in the British Museum. The gem is supposed to represent the death of Penthesilia, who has fallen to her knees while, behind, Achilles still supports her drooping person.

The fragment is highly esteemed by Freiderichs and other critics as an interesting specimen of the sculpture of the generation preceding Phidias. The half-opened eyes convey an idea of sadness, while the rest of the face is without expression. In the garments worn by the figure and in their treatment there is as yet an absence of idealization, though a departure from the art of the earliest periods is recognized. In the first periods of art the helmets of all "barbarians" are of Greek pattern. Art does not seem to have recognized differences in this particular till after the Persian war. The arrangement of the hair is quite archaic. The nude where it appears is well executed, and shows progress towards an under-

standing of the details of anatomy. The fragment is an undoubted original, and has its place in the history of the development of Greek sculpture. — *Ed.*]

Lycian Art.

FRIEZES FROM THE SO-CALLED HARPY MONUMENT.

12. The monument from which these friezes were taken was discovered in 1838 by Sir Charles Fellows during a journey through Lycia. It stood on the Acropolis overlooking the site of the ancient city Xanthus, the capital of Lycia, which stood on the river Xanthus about fifteen miles from its mouth. The monument consisted of a four-sided tower built of limestone, about seven feet square at the top, about twenty-four feet high, and covered with a flat roof beneath which on all sides were the friezes in question. They are of marble, in low relief, were originally colored, at least the background showed traces of color, and are now in the British Museum placed about a structure made in imitation of the original monument. The frieze surrounded the chamber prepared for the reception of the ashes of the deceased. It was the custom of Lycia not to bury the remains of the dead, but to deposit them in the top of a tower built for the purpose; as is mentioned by Strabo in describing the tomb of Cyrus (xv., p. 730). The opening of the chamber is in the frieze and on the west side, and is so small that only a receptacle for ashes could have been passed through.

The frieze itself can only be described in a general way, as the significance of many of the details is still obscure. On each side are figures seated on thrones; who, with one exception, are receiving gifts and worship from standing figures. That the seated figures are divinities is evident from the attributes. On the west side, the side of the opening, there are two seated female divinities at either

end of the side and facing one another. Directly in front of the one on the left is the opening; above the opening is a cow giving suck to a calf, typifying the richness and fulness of life. In front of the other divinity is a row of three worshippers. The first one, who gracefully holds her dress and veil, is probably pronouncing a prayer. The two others bring a flower, a pomegranate, and an egg. That these gifts relate in some special way to the goddess is evident from the fact that she herself holds a pomegranate and a flower. The figure of this goddess still produces a charming impression. When the delicate painting which covered it was fresh it must have been of extraordinary beauty. The ornaments on the throne and the cut lines in the background which surround it are still distinct. It is uncertain whether the rams' heads which terminate the arms of the throne and the swan's head at the back are purely ornamental or have a special relation to the goddess. The same doubt exists in reference to the ornaments on all the other thrones. The goddess first mentioned, facing the one just described, is a very similar figure except that it wears an expression of greater seriousness and dignity. The goddess holds in her right hand the dish for the receipt of oblations. This dish is the ordinary attribute of statues of divinities. The left hand, with the object it held, is no longer recognizable. The figures may have been so arranged on this side for the purpose of distinguishing a divinity of death from a divinity of life; the former by herself, solemn and severe; the latter receiving the fruits of the earth presented by happy worshippers. Or the arrangement may have been necessitated by the laws of composition; the opening could not occupy the central and most conspicuous part of the frieze, and when moved to one side it of necessity isolated one of the divinities.¹ Various names have been

¹ The position of the opening was probably prescribed by the rules of burial and may have corresponded to the position of the head of the body of the deceased. In the absence of evidence as to the size of the chamber the small size of the opening is not conclusive as to its con-

assigned to these divinities. The one seated by herself is probably Ceres, the other Proserpina; for Proserpina is often represented with the pomegranate and flower, and Proserpina and Ceres are often together. The figure seated alone is, moreover, admirably characteristic of the early conceptions of Ceres. Whoever they are they must be of the number of those divinities who are especially worshipped in reference to death and to the next world. As the female divinities on this side are worshipped by women, so the male divinities on the other three sides are worshipped by men. In the centre of the south side is enthroned a youthful divinity holding an apple in one hand and a pomegranate in the other, while a long sceptre rests against his left shoulder. He is approached by a youth who holds a dove in his left hand, while with the right he makes the gesture of adoration. The palm of the hand should be down; but as that position would have caused a projection, the hand is turned to avoid a violation of the law of relief. On the east side, the side opposite to the side of entrance, is seated a bearded divinity who, to judge by the greater size and richer decorations of his throne and by the greater space assigned to the figure itself, must be of higher rank than the others. He holds in his right a flower, while his sceptre rests on his left arm. In front a young boy offers a cock and an apple. Behind the boy is a young man accompanied by a dog. In his left the young man has a staff; with his right he presents an object no longer recognizable. Behind the divinity are two other worshippers who approach with objects hardly recognizable, probably the same as those offered on the west side. On the north side is seated a bearded divinity holding his sceptre in his

tents. The chamber may have been walled up after the body was deposited; and if the ash-receiver theory be accepted, there was undoubtedly some regulation prescribing the exact spot where it was to stand and the exact position of the opening in reference to it. Strabo, to whom Friederichs refers in his description of the tomb of Cyrus, mentions particularly that the body itself, and not its ashes, was in the chamber.

left, and with his right receiving a helmet offered by a young soldier who stands in front of him. This scene, apart from special significance, is an illustration of those dedications of arms of which both Greek art and Greek poetry present many examples. In this instance the warrior may be offering his own helmet or one captured from a foe.

Critics have concluded that the animal under the throne is a bear, — a conclusion of no assistance in recognizing the divinity.

At the ends of the north and south sides are symmetrically arranged four singular figures, one at either end of each side. They have the heads of women, the wings of birds, carry infants in their arms, and fly away from the central groups. They recall the Syrens as they are described by later poets, except that here the wings proceed, not from the shoulders, but from the arms. They can hardly be Syrens, however, as it is not of the nature of Syrens to fly away with their prey. The figures are more probably Harpies, represented as the storm winds. They are bearing away the souls of the deceased, figured under the form of infants. In early art the shades of the dead were of small size to show their unsubstantiality. They were generally winged; but here, as they are passive and being carried, wings would be superfluous. The precise connection of these figures with the central seated figures is not clear, though they may be imagined to be the messengers of divinity bearing to the abodes of bliss the souls of those whose offerings have been accepted and who have been pronounced worthy. Beneath one of the Harpies is a small figure which serves to make the monument less abstract and gives it an individual character. This figure is undoubtedly a representation of her who founded the monument to the memory of departed relatives. On her knees, deeply sunken in sorrow, with her hands to her face in the natural expression of grief, she follows with upturned eyes the flight of the Harpies. Her very small size is in accordance with the practice of both ancient and

modern art. On Greek votive slabs and in Italian votive pictures the donors are generally of diminutive proportions. The attitude and expression of this figure leave no doubt as to the character of the monument, nor as to the particular offices performed by the Harpies. It may also be inferred that the figures which adore or present gifts are representations of the departed, whose sex, occupation, and character while living are to be inferred from the attitudes and appearances of these figures. The divinities themselves may be those whom the departed especially worshipped; selected, perhaps, with the idea that those who had been honored by the living would not withhold aid and protection from the dead.

Certain peculiarities in the execution are noticeable; for instance, the contrast between the lifelike forms of the animals—the cock, the hen, and the calf—and the stiff and stereotyped human form. Such contrasts are found not only in early Greek art, but also in the arts of nations who preceded the Greeks. They result from the fact that in the representation of animals the rendition of nature was from the very outset the only object in view, while in the representation of the human form a more important object was to set forth ideas which appertained to the methods of thought of the period. Figures were intended to produce severe, solemn, and religious impressions, and such impressions were associated in the mind with certain attitudes and gestures and with certain qualities and arrangements of drapery. The mistake must not be made, therefore, of attributing these peculiarities to an inability to apprehend nature. How peculiarities of step, pose, gesture, and drapery, contribute to the impression produced by the whole composition is very noticeable on this monument.

In very early art there existed a tendency to represent similarity of employment by identity of form and gesture. A remnant of this tendency is seen in the three adoring women; though here the rigidity of the law is broken by variety in the position of arms, fall of drapery, etc.

Similar departure is seen in the varied head-dresses of the Harpies and in the different attitudes in which the child-like forms repose in their arms.

Another peculiarity is the adhesion of drapery to form. This occurs not only where the drapery is apparently drawn by the hand, but also where the hand does not touch the garment. Here is seen the germ of the endeavor of Greek art to subordinate drapery to form; so that it should not hide form, as in Assyrian art, but repeat it; "reëcho it," as it were. Again, the monument throws some light upon the question of the intent of the early Greek artist in giving his statues a smile. In the goddess whom the three women approach, and in whom Venus may be recognized, it is very evident that the smile is an effort to express friendliness, kindness, affection. So too in the Harpies, especially in the one to the right of the figure which approaches a divinity with a dove. Lucian in describing a statue by Kalamis, an elder contemporary of Phidias, speaks of its smile as solemn and fleeting (*καὶ τὸ μειδιάμα σεμνὸν καὶ λεληθός*. Imagg. 6). The expression seems illustrated in this monument.

The monument is not free from errors. The hands of the childlike forms borne by the Harpies are ill-formed and too large. The left arm of the infant above the kneeling donor is decidedly misshapen. The eyes of all the figures are to the front. In this particular, however, this monument resembles all ancient reliefs and paintings. To give the eye in profile seems to have been too difficult a task for early art to master.

The work shows a tendency towards the luxurious and the effeminate, offering in these particulars a strong contrast to the Selinus reliefs. The breasts of the female figures are large; some of the male figures are fairly fat. With this effeminacy is united a striving after graceful effects; as is seen in the position of the arms and in the manner in which objects are held by the hands.

Taste for the ornamental is seen in the decking of the thrones and in the richness of the drapery. The women

and the goddesses wear bracelets. With these tendencies there is a careful and true workmanship that shows a growing and a learning art.

The resemblance of this work to early Attic sculpture is noticeable. The warrior who presents his helmet is very like the Aristion. Many details recall the relief of the "Goddess stepping into her chariot."

The resemblance must result from the influence of the art of one country upon that of the other; for it is improbable that the arts of the two countries had a common origin. It is certain that the work in question is not pure Attic. The effeminacy spoken of, and which is clearly Asiatic, is not found in Attic sculpture. It may be that the work is the product of a Lycian art excited by the Attic. The traditions of the Cyclops, already referred to in the description of the Lion gate of Mycena, would indicate the existence in Lycia of an original school of art not derived from Greece. That in time the arts of the two countries should show points of resemblance is not extraordinary when it is considered how alike grew the Athenians and the Lycians in language and religion.

In reference to the time when the monument was made, it can only be presumed that it and the above-mentioned Attic works belong to the same period. Works resembling one another so strongly cannot have been made at times long separated.

THE SO-CALLED LEUKOTHEA.

12. An archaic marble relief in the Villa Albani.¹ The nose, the lips, and parts of the right hand of the seated

¹ On the left is a seated figure, holding on her lap a very small standing child, which lovingly extends its right hand to her. To the right of this group stands a servant woman holding in her hand, and apparently presenting, a fillet. Partially hidden by the servant are two diminutive children, one of whom is in turn partially hidden by, and is much smaller than, the other. Each of these children raises the right hand in address, or it may be in adoration. Beneath the chair, or throne, on which the principal figure is seated is a large work-basket.

figure which has received the name of Leukothea, are restored; also the right hand and the left forearm of the child in her lap, the face and the left hand of the serving-woman, and a part of the fillet she presents.

Winckelmann, on insufficient evidence, explained the scene as the reception by Leukothea of the infant Bacchus. The absence of all symbolism, however, suggests the idea that the scene may be taken from family and every-day life. The stately chair on which the principal figure is seated, and the gesture of the others towards her, which may be worshipful, may indeed be taken as indicating divinity. But the forms of the gestures may be owing to the limited powers of expression of the old style, while the chair, as an archaic chair, is not necessarily the throne of divinity. The work-basket is certainly not found outside the sphere of human activities.

The relief is undoubtedly a tombstone, and the scene shows forth the affections of family life. The idea was to dedicate to the deceased a monument of the love and of the pious remembrance which still united her to those whom she had left behind. This idea was more clearly brought out in later art, when expression had been mastered. Still the intent is already recognizable. The woman who toys with her child is undoubtedly the deceased. The two figures, whose small size was necessitated by the space to be occupied, are elder children; while the large figure, who seems about to put a fillet about the baby's head, is undoubtedly a servant. Her action may be significant, or it may be but a pleasing motive. The reliefs show such resemblance in style to the reliefs of the Harpy monument that it must be of the same time and of the same school. It is not, however, finished with the same delicacy or exactness.¹

¹ The position of the figures on the right, who stand behind one another, and apparently in perspective, has led some critics to question the antiquity of the work, as such an arrangement is not supposed to have been known to early art.

THE RELIEFS OF THASOS.

13. [Three reliefs discovered in 1864 on the island of Thasos by M. E. Miller; purchased by the Emperor Napoleon IV. and by him presented to the Louvre where they are at present. The three reliefs now form the three sides of a tomb of the Roman period. Before they were so utilized they, undoubtedly, formed one continuous relief.

In the centre of the composition is a niche, such as was used for containing the bust of a divinity. A frame surrounds it, and above is a cornice supported by pilasters. On the cornice, in Greek characters of the Roman period, is the name of the deceased for whom the work was utilized as a tomb, (Them)"istocrates, son of Eros." Under the cornice and between it and the frame is in Ionic characters of the fifth or sixth century B.C.: "To the nymphs, and to Apollo leader of the nymphs, sacrifice what you please, male or female; but neither sheep nor boar." On the frame itself is: "Let no pæan be sung." Beneath the figure supposed to be Mercury is in the same characters: "To the graces let neither sheep nor boar (be sacrificed)."

These inscriptions, which are undoubtedly original, furnish an approximate date for the composition, define its character, and explain the figures. The niche contained a sacred, and may be a very ancient, representation of Apollo. The figure to the left of the niche is probably Apollo himself. In his left hand is the lyre, and in his right was undoubtedly a plectrum. Back of him is a nymph, apparently crowning him. She is followed by three other nymphs bearing fruit, flowers, and fillets. On the other side of the niche are five figures. First, three female figures, which resemble those on the other side; then Mercury followed by a single female figure. Mercury wears an oblong garment fastened on the right shoulder. He extends the right arm, holds the caduceus

in the left, and is apparently hurrying to congratulate his brother. Near his mouth are four letters: "ollo." These may be all that is left of a salutation to Ap(ollo).

The female figures display great variety in their dress, and various degrees of excellence in their technique. Archaisms are pronounced; and strong resemblance is perceived to the figures on the Harpy monument, to the figures on the so-called Leukothea relief, and to all works so far discovered of the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. which can be attributed to northern Greek settlements. The idea is thereby suggested that while the artists of the Peloponnesus were devoting themselves to the study of the human figure, the Ionians were studying drapery and expression. It was reserved to Attica to combine and harmonize these two tendencies into the perfection of sculpture. Speculations as to which of the figures are nymphs and which graces are, as yet, vain.

The figures are further interesting by the variety displayed in the arrangement of the hair. Archaism is seen in the pointed breasts and hips, in the many-folded close-fitting garments, in the feet flat to the ground, and in the lack of profile to the eyes. The variety in the treatment not only gives assurance of originality, but shows that the artist was nearly ready to break away from the restrictions of early art. — *Ed.*]

The Art of Ægina.

THE ÆGINA MARBLES.

14. Marble statues, discovered in 1811 in the ruins of a Doric temple on the island of Ægina. The discoverers were Messrs. Cockerell and Foster, Englishmen; and Messrs. Linkh and Haller, Germans. The statues were purchased in 1812 by Prince Louis of Bavaria. They were restored and arranged by Thorwaldsen in 1817, and are now in the Glyptothek at Munich. The restoration

is among the best ever accomplished and apparently gave great satisfaction to Thorwaldsen himself; for when the work was finished he is reported to have said that he could neither see the fragments nor did he remember their existence. The statues belonged to two groups which stood in the tympana of the two pediments of the temple.

Of the western pediment the group is nearly complete. The central figure is Minerva. This statue was found entire with the exception of a few bits of the drapery. It was found directly under the centre of the pediment. That it stood in the centre of the grouping is evident from its size; and being in the centre it naturally faces the front. It might be expected that Minerva should have been represented here, as she is on many other monuments, leading her chosen people against their enemies. But if placed on one side or the other the balance of the grouping would have been destroyed, and thus an error committed against the fundamental principle of tympanum sculpture. Apart from this technicality the artist may have thought it appropriate to a temple that the goddess should be represented as an unseen deciding power standing between the parties rather than as a participant in human strife. The legs and feet of the goddess are partially in profile. This turning of the limbs was to give more room to the fallen warrior in front, and could not have been seen from below when the statues were in position. If the artist had intended to represent Minerva as the leader of the Greeks he would have expressed himself clearly and by something more decided than the mere turning of the feet.

Many parts of the figure were colored. The helmet was blue and its crest red, as is the case with all helmet crests. The blue was used to give the appearance of metal. Red was regarded as an especially magnificent and imposing color. On the top and around the edge of the helmet are small holes, where bronze ornaments were undoubtedly fastened. There are also holes in the forehead just under the helmet, where bronze locks of hair

were probably attached. The ears are bored for ear-rings. The ægis was painted to represent scales ; such scales as in later art are carved in the marble. Its edges are bored for ornaments which, according to the practice of later art, must have resembled serpents' heads, but which, if Homer's description had been followed, would have been like tassels. The shield, which the goddess carried by means of a band, is red on the inside, as are all shields, and blue on the outside ; the blue of the edge slightly overlapping the inside red. The red is supposed to represent the lining. The outside was undoubtedly ornamented with some characteristic symbol. A fragment of a shield was found on which was a female figure in very low relief. On the edge of the garments were traces of red ; whether the entire drapery was colored or not is uncertain. The plinths of the figures, which were let into the upper part of the cornice, show traces of red. The background of the pediment was blue. Lips and eyes of all the figures were colored, as appears from occasional traces of color ; and as is inferred from the smoothness and evenness of these parts, the surfaces having been preserved by the covering of color. The goddess, in accordance with the Greek ideal of female beauty, had blue eyes and light brown hair.

For the figure in front of the goddess very little restoration was necessary. The warrior has been wounded and has fallen, but he still sustains himself with his right hand. His limbs tire and his helmet falls from his head. Fights about a fallen hero, so vividly described in Homer, were often taken as subjects for artistic representation. On the earliest vases the fallen hero is always stretched out flat ; later he is represented as here, a position by which the grouping is improved and a stronger appeal made to the sentiments. Moreover, if he had been stretched out flat here, he could not have been seen from below. Thorwaldsen has so placed his sword in his hand that it stretches directly out from the pediment ; whether it did so originally is not known. On each side

of Minerva are warriors : Trojans on her left, Greeks on her right ; the supposition being that the group represents an episode from the Trojan war. Of the leader on the Trojan side both legs are modern, and also the right forearm. Of the Greek leader the head is antique, but probably did not belong to this statue. As the Trojan leader is bearded the Grecian was probably bearded also. The position given to the spears by Thorwaldsen is inaccurate. The warriors should not be represented thrusting, but hurling, their spears, and should therefore hold them horizontally. On the right shoulder and under the left arm of the Greek leader are small holes where a brazen sword-belt was fastened. The helmet of the statue is noticeable for its shape, having round cheek-pieces instead of the angular ones seen on older statues. It will also be noticed that the artist has represented the helmets thrown back, not pulled down over the face as they were in actual warfare. On earlier monuments they are represented pulled down, and take the complete form of the head and face ; later, actuality was sacrificed to the artistic necessity of presenting the face uncovered. Under the Greek's helmet is seen the cap worn to prevent the helmet from hurting.

Behind the leaders on each side are archers. The Trojan is without any especial restoration. He is clothed in tight-fitting jacket and trousers which were painted with scales. On his head he wears the Asiatic felt cap with its overhanging point. He carries his quiver on his left side. This was the Asiatic, or, rather, the Persian fashion. It was subsequently adopted by the Greeks, who originally carried the quiver on the shoulder. The Greeks, as many monuments show, also clothed their archers in tight-fitting garments. Here the Greek archer has the ordinary soldier's costume in order to distinguish him from the Trojan. He is not represented naked, because as archers did not carry shields they required armor, or protecting leather garments. The left leg from the knee downward, the two forearms, and

the head, are restorations. On the outside of his quiver is a small sheath for a short sword or dagger. On top of the quiver are holes for arrows. He seems to have just shot. The two clothed archers make an agreeable contrast with the other warriors, who are naked. The kneeling position is here necessitated by the shape of the pediment; it is also a proper one for an archer who, having no shield, should present as little as possible of his person to the enemy. The kneeling position is seen on many ancient monuments. The armor of all the contestants was undoubtedly painted. Of the pair of warriors placed next to the archers, the one on the Trojan side has been very much restored. Head and neck, the left forearm, the left knee, and the right leg from the knee down, were wanting. The position of the head cannot possibly be correct. He looks downwards, for which there is no reason, and at the same time raises his spear; an action which makes the position of the head still more striking. The corresponding figure on the Greek side was entire with the exception of the hands and the left forearm.

The relative positions in the pediment, occupied by these two warriors and by the archers, could not be determined from the places where they were found; nor are their present relative sizes a guide, because they were not found whole. It is still an open question which two stood behind the others. According to Thorwaldsen's restorations the archers are, it is true, a few inches higher than the warriors behind them. This difference would disappear on the Trojan side if the restored head of the warrior—to the position of which objection has already been made—were properly elevated; and, on the Greek side, by rectifying the restoration of the archer. Thorwaldsen has given him a helmet with a high crest, such as is worn by the other warriors, though there is no reason why this archer should not be distinguished by an especial head-gear as well as the other. Following the example of antique vases, a close-fitting cap, without a crest, would be appropriate. If such a cap were substi-

tuted the difference in size on the side also would disappear. The warriors were probably in front of the archers. Such was undoubtedly the arrangement in the eastern pediment. Archers, by the nature of their weapons, do not fight in the foremost row, nor have they a shield with which to protect themselves in the *melée*. Advance the lance-bearing warriors and their proper position and their part in the combat become at once clear. As they are placed it cannot be understood why it is that warriors who, to judge from their weapons, are intended for close fighting, should be away from the central point of action; still less why they should be on their knees. The necessities imposed by the shape of the pediment in no way account for the present arrangement.

In Greek works of art of a subordinate character, even in those that are but slightly removed from ordinary artisan-work, difficulties offered by limitation of space are so happily overcome that their existence here, in so important a work of art, cannot have controlled the composition. The kneeling, the entire action of these warriors, is understood as soon as they are placed in front of the archers. They occupy the second rank, lying in wait as it were for any unwary enemy who, drawn by a desire to rescue a fallen friend or to secure the body of a fallen foe, should venture too far from his own side. If they stood upright they would be hindered by the bodies and shields of these in the front rank; their kneeling position gives them freedom of sight and of action. The forward action of the body, as if thrusting, is now understood; behind the archers the action was pointless, for from there no thrust could reach the enemy. This change makes the whole seem more lifelike and true.¹

¹ However satisfactory may be Friederichs' conclusions, his reasoning is not artistic. No Greek artist in representing a combat would have allowed military tactics to alter his conceptions. The archers may have been placed between the spearmen to break monotony and secure proper variety. The absence of a regular gradation in the height of the figures may have been to produce waving lines to relieve the severely straight lines of the pediment.

In the corners of the pediments are prostrate wounded warriors. The Greek is drawing an arrow from his breast. The singular position of the legs is perhaps to express the pain of the wound. The right leg from the knee to the ankle, and the right forearm, are restorations. The three holes in the shoulders cannot have been for the fastening of a neck ornament. They were probably for the fastening of additional locks of hair. The wounded Trojan reaches with his left hand to a wound in his hip. The front of this figure has been very much injured. The head, the right arm, both legs from the knee downwards, and the left arm with the exception of the fingers that enclose the wound, are restorations.

These are all the figures that remain from the west pediment. As, including the fallen warrior, there are five figures on the side of the Greeks and but four on the side of the Trojans, one more is needed on the Trojan side to make the balance complete. This figure, as is evident from fragments and from the analogy of the eastern pediment, was a naked youth who, placed between Minerva and the Trojan leader, with outstretched arms was bending forward with the intention of seizing the dying Greek, securing his body, and despoiling him of his armor. This figure completed a scene similar to those so often described by Homer where desire to secure the body of the fallen excites to the intensest valor.

Of the east pediment only five figures were recovered which could be restored, but from these and from numerous fragments it is evident that the composition was precisely that of the west pediment. The figure of Minerva, of which the head has been preserved, stood in the centre; to her right the Greeks, to her left the Trojans. Beginning with the Greeks, the figure which occupied the angular end of the pediment is the first in order. It is that of an old warrior, severely wounded, fallen to the ground, who with difficulty still holds up his head. The right leg from half way down the thigh is new. On the right hip are evidences of an antique restoration. Next comes

an archer. As the close-fitting cap he wears resembles a lion's head this figure is recognized as Hercules. In other respects it is clothed precisely like the Greek archer of the west pediment. The jacket, which is of leather, is of one piece sewed together under the left arm. Over the right shoulder there is but a single strap, that the pulling arm may have greater freedom. The quiver has not been preserved, but three large holes in the back indicate where it was fastened. The right forearm, both hands, and the left leg from the knee downwards, are restorations.

This figure must have occupied the second place from the corner. Its height is but about six inches greater than that of the fallen figure in the corner; but about two feet less than that of the Greek leader, — a figure that has also been preserved. If placed next to this latter figure there would have ensued such a break in the gradual diminution of the figures as the law of pediment composition would never have tolerated. Owing to the similarity of the compositions of the two pediments, the position of the archers in this pediment supports the conclusions as to the position of the archers in the other.

The Greek leader was found in a very mutilated condition. Head, both hands, left leg, and right hip, were wanting. It is uncertain whether he was armed with a lance or with a sword.

Then comes the fallen hero about whom the fight was taking place. This figure was also greatly mutilated. The head, the right arm, the left forearm, the whole of the right leg, and the left leg from the knee down, are modern. Under the right breast and beneath the left arm are wounds. According to the restoration the warrior has fallen backwards, is still supporting himself by his left arm and by his shield, while defending himself with the sword in his right hand. Apart from the difficulties of such a position, it has not the poetry or the beauty of the position of the warrior in the other pediment, and is undoubtedly wrong. According to the weather-marks the figure must have presented its breast to the front.

As restored it belongs to the Trojan side; but if placed on the Trojan side the symmetry of the composition would be destroyed, for the fallen figure on one side must be balanced by a figure on the other of which the action is directed towards seizing and securing it. Now, this seizing and securing figure was on the Trojan side, for the weather-marks indicate that its left side was exposed; it must therefore have stood near a warrior whose shield was turned out, whose left or shield side was to the front, and who therefore must have been on the Trojan side. The fallen figure must therefore have been on the Greek side. But if placed on the Greek side then the position must be so changed that the figure will correspond with the figure in the west pediment. If placed on the Greek side in the present position, not only would the back be to the front, but the figure would continue to present awkward lines, interfering with the harmony of the entire composition.

By turning the figure on its right arm all the difficulties are solved. A sketch left by Thorwaldsen shows that at one time it was his intention to restore each of the two figures of fallen warriors alike. Fear of monotony, or perhaps the wishes of his royal patron, changed this intention.

Two small statuettes are still to be mentioned which probably stood on either side of the acroterium of one of the pediments. They are exactly alike, except that what one does with the right hand the other does with the left. This exact resemblance would indicate that they were designed merely for the purpose of architectural ornamentation. The head and hands are modern. The type occurs very frequently in archaic art, especially in representations of Venus, who appears holding her dress with one hand and a flower in the other. The names Damia and Auxesia, two Ægina female divinities, have been given by some writers to these figures.

That in the groups in the pediments deeds of Grecian heroes are represented is evident from the presence of

Hercules; that the contests are with Asiatics is evident from the dress of the opposing archer; and that, finally, the deeds commemorated were deeds of Ægina's chiefs is a natural supposition from the place where the statues were found. Tradition records an event that answers to these three suppositions; to wit, the campaign of Telamon and Hercules against Laomedon of Troy. This may be commemorated on the eastern pediment.

According to the myth Hercules was indeed the leader, and Telamon only his companion. Hercules should therefore be in the front rank, and should not occupy the subordinate position of an archer. It is distinctly stated, however, that during this campaign he fought with the bow, — a weapon in early times always attributed to him, — so that the inhabitants of Ægina had a valid excuse for putting their own hero in the more important position. The Grecian leader, then, in the east pediment, may be Telamon. To the other warriors, with the exception of Hercules, no names can be assigned.

On account of the great resemblance of the two groups it is supposable that achievements of Ægina's heroes against Troy are also represented in the western pediment. And what more reasonable than that the exploits of Ajax, the son of Telamon, should be the subject? So far critics are inclined to agree. But who is the fallen hero: Patroclus, or Achilles? In support of Achilles it is urged that Achilles was numbered among the warriors from Ægina, while Patroclus had no connection with the island. But has the fallen hero in the other pediment any connection with Ægina? If no connection of the kind exists in the one group, why should it be demanded in the other? Will not the strict parallelism of the two groups — a parallelism of thought as well as of form — be disturbed if conditions are attributed to one that do not exist in the other? The question is not so much about whom the contest is being waged, as it is whether he be a Greek or no. The clear and simple thought expressed in the composition is, that in the affrays Ægina's warriors

are the leaders. In both groups the Greeks are on the defensive. A fallen Greek is the objective. This thought if extended would seem to take from the compositions all purely individual character, and make them merely symbolical.

It cannot be denied that the law of strict architectural symmetry that governs in such works is partially responsible for the resemblance between the two compositions and between the two parts of the same composition. But was the law of archaic art governing the placing of figures in pediments so strict as to entirely account for these resemblances? If it had been the intention of the artist to represent two distinct historic scenes, could he not have individualized, and still not break the law of architectural symmetry? For instance, had he wished to give the scene of the death of Achilles, how easy to have represented that hero with an arrow piercing his heel. But just such an individualizing of circumstance would have prevented the general motive, which was to be brought out, from making itself felt. Again, if it be conceded that these statues were executed just after the Persian war, it becomes still more probable that the artist's intention was not to represent specific scenes of the Trojan war, but to glorify the later victories by generic and artistic allusion to the former. The ships of Ægina bore a glorious part in the battle of Salamis. How could the exploit be better commemorated than by reference to other times when her heroes had been of equal service to the Greeks, in conditions of equal necessity? So Pindar, in his lyrics, sings the glories of ancient heroes rather than the praises of the athletes whose victories he was called on to celebrate. The names given to the statues are arbitrary; for, except in the case of Hercules and perhaps Paris, there is nothing in the character of the work to suggest the individual. Paris is slight and delicate. In the figure of Hercules are embodied certain characteristics of the hero. His form is small, but very strongly put together, as Pindar has pict-

ured it, especially suited for endurance. The face is not without expression; the mouth is tight shut, indicating the fixed attention with which an archer pulls his bow. The mouth contrasts strongly with that of the wounded warrior who lies near him. The mouth of the latter is opened, as if he were in pain, or were pressed for breath. Still it is better not to seek for individuality or for individual expression in these marbles.

The action of the figures, though true to life and admirably balanced, is restrained. Passion, to be fully expressed, requires more energetic and excited action. On the other hand the nude is rendered with a wonderful fidelity to nature, even to the details of skin and veins.

A concession to the old style is seen in the narrowness of the hips. Some of the figures of the west pediment have a decided meagreness. Very striking is the contrast between the heads and the bodies. In all archaic art the body is more advanced than the head; here the bodies are far advanced while the heads still preserve the archaic type, especially seen in the large chin and in the very ancient manner of dressing the hair. This contrast may be found in later developments of Greek art; for Greek art pursued a course directly contrary to that followed by modern art, in which the head took precedence of the body and was the first to receive artistic attention. The first and all-absorbing object of Greek art was to represent the body with truth to nature. To represent the life of the mind and of the soul was first attempted in a far later art period, and in one affected by far different conditions.

Some peculiarities in the execution of these marbles are worthy of attention. For instance, there are none of those supports and props which are apparently necessary in marble sculptures. The artist has succeeded without them, even in spite of the shields which must have so considerably increased the weight of the bodies, and so strained the outstretched arms supporting them. The

shields are made as thin as possible, being hardly an inch thick. The helmet of the fallen warrior of the west pediment is an extraordinary piece of work in that it is so thoroughly hollowed out. Again, the care and truth with which the figures are executed extend to those parts which were turned towards the pediment and which were consequently invisible to the spectator. The artist's intention was not merely to give pleasure to the beholders, but to execute works which should be complete in themselves and worthy of the temple. In later art developments, when the period of close and laborious study had passed, and art was more genial if not also more trivial, the hard-won results of experience were slighted: the strict fidelity to truth that characterizes all the efforts of archaic art — no detail so small as to escape notice — was neglected; though, without this severe conscientiousness as a substructure, Greek art could never have attained to the glorious perfection of its highest development.¹

The wiry hair is apparently imitated from bronze work; at least such treatment is a peculiarity of bronze work, and was continued in bronze statues long after it had been given up by sculptors in marble. The peculiar curling of the locks, however, undoubtedly shows how hair at the time was worn. The historic figure of Harmodius wears the hair precisely as it is worn by these statues. It may also be inferred from the close-fitting garments of Minerva that such were the garments of the period. The change in art from close-fitting garments to loose

¹ Greek art and Greek religion were so inseparable that the presentation of an incomplete statue to a temple would have been equivalent to the offering of imperfect worship. Apart from these considerations there is quite enough in the nature of the art itself to have necessitated the full completion of the statues. No true sculptor would be satisfied until his conception had been completely embodied and fully finished. Again, though when *in situ* parts of the statues could not be seen, those parts if unfinished would have produced discordant reflections, intensified by the bright coloring of the ornaments of the figures and of the background of the pediment. If in the nature of an art sufficient causes can be found for the peculiarities of the art extraneous reasoning is superfluous and may produce error.

garments, with free falling folds, presupposes a similar change in actual life.

It is evident from the differences existing between the statues that they are not all by the same hand. Compare, for instance, the fallen hero in the corner of the east pediment with the corresponding figure in the west pediment. Apart from the differences necessitated by difference in age, the former shows a much softer, more delicate, and more flesh-like handling. In general the figures of the east gable are superior, as it is natural they should be, for the best talent would undoubtedly be employed in decorating the front of entrance. Of the west pediment the figure of the central fallen warrior is especially fine.

That the statues were not executed before the Persian war is a point not so acrimoniously contested as it was before comparisons were possible with Attic statues of known dates. If comparison be made with the monument of Aristion and with the group of the "Tyrant-Killers," it will be seen that the Ægina statues are far superior to the former, and not inferior to the latter. Even in the metope reliefs of the Parthenon there are many figures in comparison with which the Ægina marbles show a decided superiority. That they were executed not long after the Persian war is evident from their archaic character; certainly before 455 B.C., the year in which Ægina lost her independence.

Classic authors state that there existed on the island of Ægina an independent school of art. It is difficult to determine what were its peculiarities, even though so important a work as the marbles in question be in existence. One author states that the art of Ægina was inferior to the art of Attica, and he apparently gives as a reason that the artists of Ægina made their figures too thin. This criticism would apply to the greater part of the figures under discussion. In the sculpture of Selinus, on the contrary, there is a tendency towards too great fulness, and in both Attic and Lycian art figures are more often stout than thin.

If the figures of the Ægina groups be compared with the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, where the motive is the same, the great contrast will be found to result from the fact that, though the Ægina figures are supposed to be engaged in the most intense conflict, they display no such tension of the muscles as characterizes the Attic group. It is this tension that makes the group so life-like, that excites enthusiasm in spite of archaisms; for sympathy is felt for the artist in his efforts to express force and passion and to depict the wildness and impetuosity of fight. No such enthusiasm is excited by the Ægina marbles. They are without fire or dash. Entirely absorbed in a close and minute imitation of nature, the Ægina artists have entirely neglected the action which both feeling and fancy demand in a representation of fighting heroes. It were unjust to assert this of all the figures. The dying warrior in the corner of the east pediment is a figure that appeals most deeply and truly to the sentiments.¹

Peloponnesian Art.

THE MILESIAN APOLLO OF KANACHOS.

15. [Kanachos flourished about 500 B.C. His greatest work, and one of the most celebrated works of this early period, was a colossal bronze Apollo made for the Branchidæ and dedicated in the temple of the Didymean Apollo. It was taken away by Xerxes, or Darius, and restored by Seleucus. Pliny's account of the statue (N.H., xxxiv, 75) continues to puzzle philologists. From coins of the locality which have been recovered it appears that the god held in the right hand a stag, — perhaps the stag of which Pliny has left such a confused description; though, from the description as it

¹ The figures are all under life-size. Minerva, the tallest, is but 5 feet 3 inches. See Heinrich Brunn's Catalogue of the Glyptothek.

appears in modern editions of the author, neither the mechanism of the stag nor its relations to the statue can be understood,—and in the other hand a bow. A small bronze in the British Museum represents a figure with the long hair of an Apollo, holding in its right hand a diminutive animal which may be a stag, and having the fingers of the left so grasped that in the hollow they make may well have been a bow. The figure is heavy, with largely developed muscles, and presents other peculiarities of early Doric art. It shows an advance on the metopes of Selinus, but in the same line of development.

A small bronze in the Louvre has the same motive, and may have been derived from the same original. The two bronzes, however, present interesting differences. The attitudes are substantially the same. In the London statue some of the locks fall in front; in the other, all fall behind. In neither face is expression well developed, but in the London face it is far in advance of the other. On the left foot of the Louvre statue is the inscription:—

“ΑΘΑΝΑ: Α
ΔΕΚΑΤΑΝ.”

In the Louvre statue the feet, and the legs from the knee down, are well modelled. The rest of the person is carelessly executed. Very singularly the back is more carefully executed than the front.

This little bronze has been the object of much discussion. Its archaic or pseudo-archaic character, the date and the genuineness of the inscription, and the existence of another inscription on one of the eyes, have all furnished topic for disputation. — See last editions of Müller's *Handbuch*. — *Ed.*]

THE STRANGFORD APOLLO.

16. [An interesting statue, to which attention has been lately attracted by the revival of interest in archaic art.

It belonged to the collection of Lord Strangford († 1855) and is now in the British Museum. Unfortunately it is not known where or when it was found. The arms are wanting, and the legs from the knees down. From the fact that there are no traces of supports for the arms on hips or legs it is supposed that the arms were held forward after the manner of the Apollo of Kanachos. Shoulders are still very broad, and hips very narrow, after the manner of the Apollo of Tenea; but anatomy has been carefully observed and brought out. The positions of the various parts of the skeleton are well understood. The collar-bones, for instance, and the line of the false ribs, are given; the true ribs are also properly marked. The lines of muscles are correctly traced, and the masses generally well laid on. The breast muscles are unnaturally large, and the horizontal divisions of the abdominal muscles are not correct. The legs are better executed than the body. The muscles flow into one another with truth, and not without a certain degree of beauty. In the neck there is lack of detail. Head and face are still quite archaic. The eyes have the peculiarity of being deep sunken. In this particular they differ strongly from the eyes of the Ægina statues.

This torso is one of the most interesting specimens of pre-Phidian sculpture. It shows the rapidity with which art was freeing itself from the trammels of archaism, and was preparing itself for the development of beauty. To the anatomist it offers interesting and profitable study. The archæologist is still inquiring into its origin. — *Ed.*]

THE CHOISEUL-GOUFFIER APOLLO.

17. [A colossal statue in the British Museum; formerly in the collection brought about the end of the last century by Choiseul-Gouffier from Constantinople.

The left hand, and the right arm from above the elbow, are wanting. The figure shows archaisms in the large muscles, in the expressionless features, and in the

arrangement of the hair. Anatomy has been carefully studied and mastered. Even the veins are in places indicated, and indicated correctly. The statue seems to show the extreme degree of development to which the Peloponnesian school was capable of attaining; the limit of a sculpture which was hard, severe, imitative, decorative, and monumental, but not artistic. The arrangement of the hair is singular. It is long and braided. Two braids start above, and a little back of the ears, cross, and are brought to the front of the head and fastened over the forehead; while some of the front hair is allowed to fall in curls over the forehead from beneath the braids.

The figure has been called an Apollo, but there is nothing in form or attribute to suggest divinity; while the pose, the size of the muscles, and the arrangement of the hair, immediately suggest an athlete. On the supporting tree trunk is a projection which has been regarded as the end of the himas, or strap, with which boxers bound their fists. Dr. Waldstein, of Cambridge, goes so far as to claim that the statue is by Pythagoras of Rhegium in Italy, and that it represents Euthymos, a celebrated pugilist. (The Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. i and ii.)

Additional interest has been given to the statue by the discovery in 1864 of a similar statue in the ruins of the temple of Bacchus in Athens, and by the further discovery of an omphalos bearing on its flattened top the impression of two feet. Precisely how near the two were found together does not appear; but some German critics have rushed to the conclusion that the two were united, and that, consequently, the Athenian statue and all statues resembling it were Apollos; the original type being Apollo standing on the omphalos. The Athenian statue is, of course, without feet, or the theory could not have been started. These critics also claim that there are in existence statues known to be Apollos where the hair is similarly arranged. The question is fully discussed by Conze. (Beiträge: Halle; 1869:) To the art student

the statue is interesting as an admirable specimen of pre-Phidian sculpture. It shows that realism and technical excellence do not of necessity lead to artistic development, and it permits the supposition that even better efforts of the schools, which the statue represents, would not have resulted in the production of a school of true art; as there is no manifestation of even a germ of the sense of beauty. There are many Greek works far less developed, which are, nevertheless, truly artistic; the Penelope of the Vatican, for instance. In every work, to be a work of art, there must be beauty of form or beauty of sentiment.

Another copy of the original statue is in the Vatican; a third one in the Uffizi. These ancient copies show that the original was highly esteemed in antiquity. Their sharp lines indicate that the original was in bronze. (Pau. vi, 6.) — *Ed.*]

Imitative Archaic Art.

The early images of the gods were not abandoned as art progressed. They were retained in their places in the temples, and remained objects of worship even in the time of the fullest development of art. Pictures from ancient vases afford the best evidence of this custom. Wherever worship is depicted the object of worship is always represented in most primitive and archaic style.

The Greeks did not hesitate, however, to set up by the side of these old and severe images new representations of the gods to satisfy artistic taste. In a temple of Bacchus there was a satyr of Praxiteles standing by an old wooden image of Bacchus; so says Pausanias. Comparisons could not fail to be made between the old and the new statues, with conclusions apparently in favor of the old; they were more solemn, simpler, and better adapted to purposes of worship. Æschylus is said to have been of this opinion, finding the older statues more

the feet, are new. The figures in the lower rows on all three sides were substantially preserved. Opinions differ as to the purpose to which this pedestal may have been applied. It may have been an altar, as it has been named. It was more probably the support of a tripod, or of some other three-legged utensil; as similarly shaped pedestals are often found supporting tripods, candelabra, etc., etc.

The object in selecting the reliefs is of course unknown in the absence of information of the circumstances of the erection of the monument. The style is easily recognized as imitative archaic. In true archaic the feet are in profile. Here, in the upper row, many are to the front and singularly foreshortened to prevent them from projecting. The selection and grouping of the twelve gods is in accordance with the system early adopted at Athens and subsequently generally accepted by the heathen world. The artist seems to have worked after Attic models. The figure of Juno is especially Attic.

The lower rows contain groups of the Graces, the Seasons, and the Fates. They are larger than the chief divinities, because the laws of architecture demanded that the lower row should be higher than the upper. The Fates and the Seasons are not represented as they appear on later monuments. The Fates are majestic goddesses bearing the sceptre of power; but they are precisely alike, while later art gives them different appearances and different activities. The Seasons, too, are more alike than they appear later. This resemblance applies to their attributes — a branch, clusters, and a bud, or it may be a fruit — as well as their drapery. These attributes do not distinguish the Seasons from one another, but in a general way symbolize vegetable life, growth, etc. The Graces are dancing, as the poets sing of them, to represent emotions of joy.¹

¹ The monument is about six feet high; the three sides, about four feet broad at the bottom, and about three feet broad at the top. Attention will be attracted by the apparent subordination of relief-

The work has suffered from careless restorations. Of the divinities in the upper row of the principal side Jupiter and Juno are entirely antique. Jupiter may have held a long sceptre in his left hand, though no traces of one exist. Of the third figure the entire upper part of the body is new. As one of the teeth and part of the shaft of a trident remained, the figure was restored as Neptune; the restoration is sufficiently satisfactory. The companion figure to Neptune, which is new from the hips up, has been properly restored as Ceres. Following the pedestal around to the right; on the second side in the upper row, are Apollo, Diana, Vulcan, and Minerva. Of Apollo and Diana only the lower portions are antique. The plectrum in the right hand and the long flowing garments indicate that Apollo was represented as playing on the lyre; an instrument which the restorer should have placed in his left hand, giving the god at the same time a more masculine countenance. Mistakes were also made in restoring the figure of Diana which follow. Only a small bit of the bow was wanting; the restorer has, however, added a long piece, giving the bow an exaggerated and unhappily length. The restorer was probably misled by supposing that Diana's bow must in some way differ from that ordinarily carried by Apollo, while in fact art represents the two as carrying similar bows. The next figure, Vulcan, of which the upper part of the body is new, has received from the restorer a woman's breast, though the personality of the god is perfectly indicated by the tongs held in the right hand. Of Minerva, a part of the right breast bearing the ægis, the legs from below the knees, and the lance, are the only antique portions. The third side of the pedestal is in a far better state of preservation. The figures in the upper row are Mars, Venus, Mercury, and Vesta. Of Mars, part of the helmet, the end of the spear, and a part of the hips, are modern; of Venus, only the top of the head-dress. Mercury required no restoration. Of Vesta, the head, the left breast and arm, and

gliding rather than a stepping. This idea is still further carried out by the backward flow of the garments, and is singularly contradicted by the action of the little stag, which must therefore be regarded simply in the light of an attribute. In the veil, the crown, and the long tresses, the statue differs from the ordinary representations of the virgin Diana. The artist's intentions were to represent not the huntress Diana, but Diana, Queen of Heaven, in long garments, gliding over hill and dale through the glimmering moonlight. The picturesque treatment of the drapery is hardly within the limits of plastic art, and assigns the statue to the very latest period of Greek sculpture; while the head-dress and the ornaments on the quiver band are purely archaic.¹

PANHERMES.

22. Found in 1779 by Gavin Hamilton near Civita Lavinia, the ancient Lannuvium. It belonged to the Towneley collection and is now in the British Museum. The right arm, a part of the left forearm, most of the flute, and the hermes down from where the drapery terminates, are modern. The figure is undoubtedly Pan, though the divinity here represented with unusual delicacy and grace. The syrinx was Pan's favorite instrument, but the flute is none the less typical. The figure is a most elegant imitation of an archaic idol. A wooden post surmounted by the mask of a god and covered with most carefully arranged garments constituted one of the earliest forms in which divinity was worshipped.

THE SO-CALLED ALTAR OF THE TWELVE GODS.

23. A three-sided marble pedestal formerly in the Borghese collection in Rome; since 1808 in the Louvre.

¹ No. 93 in Brunn's Catalogue of 1868.

left shoulder. On the arms, and passing across the back below the waist, the figure carries a light shawl with symmetrical falling ends. This was a favorite piece of drapery during the old style. The crooked and right-angular bending of the arms is also a peculiarity of the old style. On the back of the shoulders is a protuberance indicating that the hair was worn long and brought together in a bunch. The workmanship is excellent, and the statue is one of the most interesting of antiquity.¹

DIANA.

(From Heinrich Brunn's Catalogue of the marbles of the Glyptothek of Munich.)

21. Of Greek marble; H. 1, 65; found in 1792 at Gabii; purchased in Rome from the Braschi collection. The nose, bits of the diadem, the left forearm, the right hand, and a few pieces of the drapery, are restorations. Of the stag, the fore feet, the ears and horns, and the ends of the hind legs, are also restorations. The figure is richly clad in a short-sleeved chiton opening on the left side, bound about the middle, and doubled apparently at the neck, the outer part falling back to the girdle. From the back of the head a long veil falls nearly to the feet. The quiver is carried by a band which passes from the right shoulder to the left hip. The band is ornamented with hunting scenes in very low relief. Only the top of the quiver is given. On the head, from which long locks fall down on the breast, is a crown composed apparently of diminutive stags and candelabra. On the right a little stag rears itself on its hind legs, while the goddess holds its fore feet in her right hand. The work shows a strange mingling of the motives of archaic art with those of fully developed art. The entire figure is constrained. The position of the feet, which are close together and touch the ground with the ends of the toes only, indicates a swift

properly should be twelve scenes, but the artist has been as careless about the number as he has been forgetful to designate the gods by their proper attributes. With the exception of Jupiter on the first and Minerva on the fifth, the gods and goddesses cannot be recognized, and on many of the reliefs the same figures and the same actions are repeated. This statue was probably executed in recollection of the celebrated archaic statue of Minerva Polias, which stood in the Erechtheum, and to which every year was brought a garment on which were woven scenes from the war of the gods and giants. How these scenes were arranged may possibly be learned from this fragment.¹

THE MUNICH BACCHUS.

20. A marble statue, formerly in the Bracchi palace in Rome, now in the Glyptothek, in Munich. The head, the fore-arms, and the feet are modern. The restorer was of the impression that the figure represented a priest of Bacchus. Judging from other similar statues the figure more likely represented Bacchus himself; and, instead of cup and pitcher, the restorer should have placed a goblet in the right and the thyrsus in the left. The figure is similar to the old temple statues of the god. The careful treatment of form shows it, however, to be but an imitation of the archaic. The drapery is very singular. A fine woollen garment, with short sleeves, reaches from the neck to the feet; over this a skirt hangs from the waist to the ankles. These two garments cling closely to the legs. About the waist, also, is bound a panther's skin, the head falling down between the legs of the statue, and a paw on each side covering the hips; while two singular elongated pieces, without reference to the natural shape of the leopard's skin, are carried up from the waist before and behind and fastened over the

¹ O. Jahn (*De antiquissimis Minervae simulacris Atticis*, Bonn, 1866, § 12) claims that the statue is a copy of the Minerva Polias. No. 42 in Dr. Hermann Hettner's Catalogue of the Dresden Collection, 1875.

and Ariadne as well as to Venus and Diana; and it is well known that Greek women colored their hair blonde. The head of the figure is surrounded by a diadem, which was at first common to every goddess, but which is wanting from the later, more beautiful and more maidenly representations of Diana. The diadem here is like a garland, and is ornamented with gold or red roses.¹

THE SO-CALLED DRESDEN MINERVA FRAGMENT.

19. A marble statue purchased in 1728 with the collection of the Roman Prince Agostino Chigi and since that date in the Dresden collection. The fragment is without head or arms; the feet have been restored. From repetitions of the statue in existence, and from indications furnished by the statue itself, the conception may be easily completed. Minerva is represented in the moment of attack; in her raised right hand a spear; on her left arm a shield. So Rauch has restored her in a plaster cast that stands by the side of the statue. The type represented by this figure is of frequent occurrence in archaic Greek art. The Minerva of the *Abgina* group has, for instance, almost identical drapery. The only essential difference is that in the *Abgina* figure the broad central fold that marks the fall of the garments in front was left plain, or at the most colored; here it is ornamented with small round reliefs. This difference indicates that the Dresden figure was executed at a later period than would be inferred from its stiff appearance; for in the earlier times such ornamentations were confined to color, or if in relief were in very low and flat relief. The free manner in which the reliefs are executed indicates still further that the statue is a comparatively modern imitation of the archaic style. These reliefs are eleven in number and give scenes from the war of the gods and giants. There

¹ When I last saw the statue, in 1877, traces of color had almost entirely disappeared. No. 894 in the catalogue of the Naples Museum; old number, 411.

within the temple as an object of worship. The fingers of both hands and the bit of the garment held in the right hand are restorations. In the left was some attribute, a bow or a torch, most probably a torch.

Archaic temple sculpture is very closely imitated in the statue, even in reference to size; as in the earliest times, and in later times also, statues of the gods were often made very small, sometimes even doll-like. The statue has the winning childlike grace so often seen in archaic works. Especially fine are the feet, and the face with the dimple in its chin. During the best art periods a dimple was only given to children or to roguish beings; occasionally to Venus. Very graceful is the manner in which the garment is held, a favorite motive of the old style. The modelling of the nude, the position of the eyes, and the free lines of the falling locks are quite enough, however, to show that the statue is not archaic.

The character of Diana is not yet thoroughly developed in this statue. Later she was represented of a slighter figure, clothed with one simple armless garment, and without the falling locks, a trait the old style seems to have attributed to all the gods and goddesses alike. The advancing step is characteristic of Diana, who is generally represented with even a livelier movement. Very remarkable is the coloring of this statue, which, though of course not so strong as when the statue was first unearthed, is still quite noticeable. The sandals, their straps, and the border of the under garment, are red; the over garment has a broad red edge ornamented with white and gold palm-leaves, as if embroidered. The edge helps still further to distinguish the outer from the under garment, from which it also differs in texture. Such garments were worn in actual life, and were consequently adopted by art. The strap that supported the quiver was also red, with white ornaments. The hair was gilded to appear blonde, regarded as the most beautiful color by the ancients. Poets gave blonde hair to the most beautiful personages of mythology; for instance, to Achilles

godlike than the newer and more artistic ones. (Porphyrus *de abstinentia*, Lib. ii., § 18.) As Æschylus lived at the time when the old style was giving place to the new, the contrast naturally impressed him. As a result of these preferences, which were general and wide-spread, however odd they may appear from a modern point of view, and so long as they existed, the peculiarities of the old style were adhered to in the execution of statues which were intended to be objects of worship. A number of statues and bas-reliefs are in existence which, though they are not exact copies of archaic works, resemble them so strongly that they produce the same impression. That these works were intended for religious purposes is in some cases evident, in other cases it may be inferred. The imitation of the old style is at times so close that it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the old from the new. Generally, however, the new statues betray themselves by an intermingling of later types, by freer forms and lines, and, at times, by a spirit of caricature. Religious sentiment and the purposes of worship were not the exclusive causes of these imitations. A fashionable taste for the style of a past age may have been as operative in ancient as it frequently is in modern life. The first reason must, however, be accepted in reference to the major part of existing works. The fact that they are imitations makes it virtually impossible to assign a date to their production, for in an imitation the effort is to conceal the time of production. Though as imitations they may not be prized by the artist they are valuable to the art historian for the information they give in reference to the ancient types of the gods. Nor do they fail to throw some light upon the artistic character of genuine archaic work.

DIANA.

18. A small marble statue, found on the 19th of July 1760 within the ruins of a small temple in Pompeii; now in the Naples Museum. The statue undoubtedly stood

THE CAPITOL WELL-CURB.

24. A circular marble frieze found in Rome not far from the Porta del Popolo; for over a hundred years in the Capitol. The restorations are of slight importance. The head of Venus is new; the heads of Diana and Vesta are partially new. The frieze undoubtedly surrounded the mouth of a well. It is adapted to such a use and to no other. If the marks of ropes on the inner edge and along the inner side are antique, they furnish strong corroboration. Such works were highly esteemed by the Romans. Cicero sent to Athens for well-mouths to ornament his villa. The work in question was probably about a well within the precincts of a temple.

ious thought to artistic order, and the idea may be suggested that the monument is merely decorative and can have served no religious purpose. What the monument was is not known, but its secular character is not to be inferred from the manner in which personages are distributed upon it. With the Greeks religion and art were so unified that no arrangement of divinities necessitated by the requirements of art could shock the religious beholders. We may imagine the gods complacently taking the positions assigned to them and enlarging or diminishing their stature in answer to the request of the artist. Egyptian artists were the servants of the priests, employed to carry out their directions to every minute detail that in the work of art used for purposes of worship there might be no deviation from a prescribed pattern. Among the Greeks the invention of the artist might lead to a new form of worship in harmony with it.

We can imagine the pedestal, with its three irregular sides, presented to the artist with the commission to sculpture upon it the superior gods, the Graces, the Seasons, and the Fates. The superior gods were twelve in number; the Fates were three; the Graces three; and the Seasons three also, according to Homer and Hesiod. So the figures fell naturally into three subdivisions of seven each; four superior gods and three subordinate divinities to each side of the pedestal.

The most elementary religious notions led the artist to put the superior gods on top; the most elementary artistic notions suggested that the lesser number of figures must be counterbalanced by greater size to each figure and by greater space in the grouping. Again, the artist felt that if he departed from isokephalism, and gave any one divinity its due religious preëminence, he would destroy the line of beauty which in such a monument must be regular. The result was undoubtedly satisfactory; the beauty of the arrangement increasing the fervor and religious joy of the worshippers.

No. 1 in Fröhner's Catalogue of 1876.

The frieze represents the twelve gods separated into two unequal parties, four in one and eight in the other, the parties apparently marching against each other. From the right come Vulcan, Neptune, Mercury, and Vesta. From the left, Jupiter and Juno, Minerva and Hercules, Apollo and Diana, and Mars and Venus. The meaning of this division and arrangement is not clear. The scene is probably the marriage of Hercules and Minerva, — a myth to which no classic author alludes, but which is often represented in art. If this be the theme, the gods accompanying the bridal pair must be those who are favorable to the nuptials; and the four others, those opposed. Jupiter and Juno, Apollo and Diana, and finally Venus, with whom Mars is necessarily associated, are the protecting divinities of love and marriage. Vulcan, who leads the other party and threatens Jupiter with his hammer, had himself been a suitor for Minerva's hand, demanding it as compensation for the assistance he rendered at the time of her birth. Neptune and Minerva, though subsequently partially reconciled, were enemies from the time each lay claim to Attica. Still some of the divisions seem arbitrary, and the subject may be other than the one supposed.

Of the divinities who march in pairs Hercules is the only god who does not precede the accompanying goddess. His position behind Minerva and a certain timidity and bashfulness in his step go far to mark him as a bridegroom.

The work is very interesting for the information it gives of the archaic conceptions of the gods. That the work is not truly archaic, but imitative, is evident from the figure of Mercury who in true archaic work is bearded, stouter, and older. The playing with the goat, or ram, is a specimen of the sportive and youthful spirit often seen on archaic monuments. Apollo is sometimes represented pressing his dragon to his bosom; Diana, leading her stag by the hand, etc. In later art this spirit disappeared, and animals are merely formal attributes.

The archaic style is well imitated, too, in the shape and proportions of form. The figures are thick-set and muscular, and of hardly more than six and a half heads in length. Many of the figures, too, have the falling locks so characteristic of the old style.¹

APOLLO AND VICTORY.

25. A marble relief from the collection of Sir W. Hamilton, now in the British Museum.

Within a Corinthian temple Apollo and Victory stand facing one another, Victory gracefully pouring out a libation which Apollo receives in a shallow dish held in his right hand while with his left he holds the lyre. He is dressed in long flowing garments and is represented as a *Kitharoedos*. At first sight one would suppose that Apollo, having finished his play, was being refreshed by Victory, — who may in a general way be regarded as the cup-bearer of Olympus, — and that the artist had conceived the situation so as to afford a pleasing subject for plastic representation. A certain seriousness in the composition and the number of similar reliefs which have been found indicate a different intent.

The relief is undoubtedly a tablet commemorating a musical contest. Victory in behalf of the donor thanks Apollo for success.

The relief is very graceful. It has many archaic characteristics, but that it is only imitative archaic is sufficiently evident from the Corinthian architecture, an order that did not exist during the archaic art periods.

The band that passes over the left hand and supports the lyre is peculiar. It is so arranged that though the hand supports the instrument the fingers are left free. The lyre was played with both hands; the right used the

¹ Friederichs' notion that the frieze was about the mouth of a well is not universally accepted. Others suppose it to have been about an altar. No. 31 in Braun's "*Die Ruinen und Museen, Roms*," of 1854.

plectrum; the left, the fingers. The left probably gave the accords, the right the melody.¹

THE DRESDEN TRIPOD PEDESTAL.

26. In marble, purchased for Dresden with the Chigi collection.

On one side is represented the contest of Hercules and Apollo for the Delphic tripod. Between the contestants is the omphalos, the round Delphic stone which was regarded by the ancients as the navel or centre of the earth.

On the other two sides of the pedestal are scenes that are similar to one another. A sacred article upon a pedestal is being dedicated, the dedication in each scene consisting of wrapping bands about the utensil. On one side the article is a tripod; on the other, a torch contained in a vessel designed to receive the waste and to protect the hands. A male and a female figure are on each side, probably priestly personages: one has a broom for the cleaning of the temple.

The meaning of the scenes taken separately is clear enough, but their significance when taken together is not so plain. The pedestal undoubtedly supported a candelabrum or a tripod, — more probably the latter, — the hole in the centre of the top of the pedestal showing where the fourth and central support of the tripod was fastened. The tripod was probably won in some contest and set up and dedicated to the god in whose honor the contest took place. Accepting this supposition, the scenes may be understood as follows. The contest between Hercules and Apollo for the Delphic tripod typifies the contest in which the tripod was won. The other scenes are: first,

¹ The reader has already become sufficiently acquainted with Greek sculpture to have noticed the freedom the Greek artist allowed himself in his conceptions. The anachronism of archaic figures within Corinthian architecture would not have troubled a Greek if he found the combination artistically satisfactory.

the actual consecration of the prize; and, secondly, the consecration of something in some way connected with the victory. As this thing is evidently a torch, the contest may have been a foot-race with torches.

The god to whom the tripod is dedicated is partially indicated by the ivy with which the broom-bearing priest is crowned; more clearly by the ornaments under the relief. Kneeling satyrs support the corners of the pedestal. Between the satyrs are other bacchanalian figures bearing cups sacred to Bacchus. Very singular wing-like appendages have been given to the satyrs to fill up the spaces between them and the central figures. These arabesques and the full and free manner of their execution indicate that the archaic portions of the work are only imitations.¹

PERIOD OF THE HIGHEST DEVELOPMENT.

FIRST DIVISION OF THE PERIOD; B.C. 450 TO B.C. 400.

From the middle of the fifth to the end of the fourth century B.C., Greek sculpture is so excellent that these three half centuries may be regarded as constituting the period of its highest development. Still within this period there are differences of style. These differences are especially noticeable in the statues of the gods.

The contemporaries of Phidias believed in the gods and believed in them as they had been conceived by Pindar and Æschylus. To these inspired poets the gods revealed themselves as purer, more solemn, and holier, beings than the Homeric divinities. But the artists of the fourth century were sceptics. They accepted the gods as objects of representation and endowed them with charms

¹ No. 106, in Dr. Hermann Hettner's Catalogue of 1875.

and graces; but they could no longer impart to their statues that solemn and ethical severity which in former images enforced reverence and worship, because there was no longer a faith in the real existence of the denizens of Olympus. The history of religious art may be briefly stated as follows. In the earliest sculpture the chief object in view was to present religious ideas by means of accepted types. Beauty was neglected; was not unfrequently intentionally disregarded. As time progresses little by little the principle of beauty is recognized, till finally it supersedes and extinguishes religious impression.

During the latter part of the fifth century the claims of beauty and the demands of religion were about equally recognized. The art characteristic of the period under discussion is, therefore, the recognition of beauty, but its subordination to religion wherever religion requires the retention of early types.

The majority of the works belonging to the period which so far have been discovered are Athenian. Those which are not Athenian are so few in number and their origin is so doubtful that it is useless to attempt a division into schools.

Those statues will be first considered which were probably not intended to supplement architectural effects — free standing, independent works, statues in the round; — then, works that were in any way connected with temple architecture, friezes, metopes, tympanum statues, etc., no very strict division or limitation being intended; — finally all other kinds of reliefs. Under this latter head, for purposes of unity, reliefs from the fourth century as well as those from the fifth, will be considered.

[NOTE. — Battle of Marathon, 490; of Salamis, 480; of Plataea, 479. Political career of Pericles and period of Athens' greatest power and highest position, 460 to 430. Ageladas, in Argive, supposed master of Phidias, was born about 540. Polycletus and Myron are also supposed to have been his pupils. Phidias was born in 490; died in prison in 432. Polycletus flourished from 452 to 412. Myron was about ten years younger than Phidias. Alkamanes, and Paionios were pupils of Phidias. Kresilas, a native of Crete, was a supposed pupil of Myron.]

Independent Works, &c.

VESTA.

27. A marble statue formerly in the Giustiniani Palace in Rome. It has passed into the possession of the Roman banker Torlonia and is no longer publicly exhibited.

The forefinger of the left hand is modern. The statue formerly held a sceptre, as appears from a hollow along the inner side of the left hand. A sceptre, moreover, was the ordinary attribute of Vesta.

No other ancient work gives such a clear and strong idea of the solemn, impressive, and religious, majesty of Greek statues of the best period. It was the intention of the artist to produce a goddess who should represent the sanctity and inviolability of those family relations which the ancients conceived as having for their central point the hearth-stone. With a severity that is almost harsh he has excluded every womanly grace. The folds of the garment that fall from the waist are as spare as possible; no irregularity modifies the descending lines. Even the foot is kept within the skirt so that the perpendicularity of the lines, and the column-like appearance this perpendicularity produces, should in no way be disturbed. The bending at the hip is produced by a scarcely perceptible departure from the perpendicular. The slight turning of the head and the few rippling folds where the upper garment meets the skirt are all that give life to the figure, and all that distinguish its style from pure archaic.

The heavy veil which covers the head is not without significance. It is the head covering usually assigned by art to matronly personages such as Rhea, Juno, and Ceres, to distinguish them from younger and unmarried divinities. Here it gives expression to that fulness of womanly dignity which belongs to Vesta even though a virgin. The serious dignity of the statue is farther increased by the arrangement of the hair. It falls over the forehead in

the thick locks which art gave to the divinities of the lower world. The sceptre, which was held close to the body to keep within narrow bounds the lines of the composition, still further increased impressiveness. The right hand is against the hip; not touching it lightly as an expression of ease or grace, but placed firmly to increase the impression of reliability and assurance.

The face is beautiful in its severity. Eyelids and eyebrows are very sharp. The lips are surrounded by an indented line. The top of the nose is flat with sharp edges. The marking of the lips by an indented line occurs frequently in bronze statues and is often seen on vases. The peculiarity is rare in marble. Some of the statues of *Ægina* furnish examples. It must not be inferred from the wiry character of the hair that the statue is a copy of a bronze original; for hair was similarly treated in marble during the old style to which this statue is so near. It is undoubtedly an original Greek work, and was most likely erected as an object of worship.

The peculiarities of the old style seen in the statue are not to be attributed to any incapacity on the part of the artist for true rendering. The artist undoubtedly intentionally retained them; for he conceived the goddess as severe and earnest and associated such qualities with archaic peculiarities of treatment.

The fact that the artist was able to produce such wonderful impressions while working within the limits of archaic restrictions reveals him as one of the greatest sculptors of antiquity.¹

PARTHENON STATUETTE OF MINERVA.

28. A small unfinished marble statue of Minerva found

¹ No statue gives a higher idea of the Greek conception of divinity. It enables one to understand the satisfaction philosophers and poets found in classical mythology. A study of Greek that does not include this statue is incomplete. It is one of the first statues of which a cast occupies a prominent position in every institution of classical learning.

in 1859 not far from the Pnyx in Athens. Now probably in the New Museum of Athens.

This little statue is undoubtedly copied from the gold and ivory statue of Minerva by Phidias which stood in the Parthenon.¹

The statue by Phidias stood upright and was clothed with the chiton. It held in its right hand a statue of Victory. The open right hand of this little statuette suggests similar action. The left hand of Phidias' statue rested on a shield as does the left hand of the statuette. On the outside of the shield was a representation of a combat with Amazons. On the exterior of the shield held by the statuette a combat is undoubtedly depicted. The figures are indistinct; one, however, can be recognized as seizing an enemy by the hair, an action that may well indicate that the enemy is an Amazon. Near the shield of the statue by Phidias was a snake to symbolize the earth-born Erichthonius. In the statuette, the snake hides itself behind the shield: an arrangement which is not only artistically pleasing but also true to the serpent's nature. This arrangement was undoubtedly copied from Phidias. Some things are lacking to make the statuette perfectly correspond with the descriptions of the Parthenon statue; the spear for instance, which as well as the shield must have been held by the left hand. The reliefs on the inner side of the shield are wanting; also the ornaments of the helmet, and the head of Medusa on the ægis.

On the basis of his statue Phidias represented the birth of Pandora. On the basis of the statuette there are reliefs which so far as they can be made out do not seem in any way to relate to the subject selected by Phidias.

In the British Museum there is a marble fragment of a part of a shield that bears a great resemblance to the shield of this statuette. It has the round Argolic form peculiar

¹ It so corresponds to the descriptions of Pausanias, Pliny and others, that it is probably one of the little copies sold to travellers as mementos of a visit; just as nowadays statuettes of works in the Vatican are brought away from Rome.

to shields of Minerva, and on it is clearly seen a combat with Amazons. Even Phidias may be recognized in the figure of an old man hurling a stone; as Phidias is reported to have sculptured himself on the shield in such an attitude. For this act of impious desecration he was thrown into prison and was kept there till he died. The resemblance of the relief on the fragment to the relief on the shield of the statuette is an additional proof that the statuette is copied from the Parthenon Minerva.

In reference to the art character of the statuette and of the original from which it is copied, Conze¹ observes as follows:

"The one thing that may be best preserved in a copy of a colossal statue, even though the copy be in very small proportions, is the general arrangement of the original. The most striking peculiarity of the statuette is the symmetrical ordering of the two sides of the figure. The head has but a scarcely perceptible turning to the right. Corresponding locks of hair fall on each side on the shoulders, and the ægis is divided into two equal parts directly in the centre of the breast. Still more remarkable is the arrangement of the arms; for they leave the body at the same angle.

The straight line, the line of repose, governs in the whole composition. This sense of repose is increased by the perpendicular fall of the drapery.

Let the imagination place the original of this statuette in the midst of the Doric Parthenon, whose severe architecture was governed by the strictest rules of symmetry, and it will at once be seen how beautifully the statue must have been adapted to the surrounding architectural order. Any livelier attitude, even the raising of an arm, would have been discordant, and would have destroyed the harmony of the whole. Phidias undoubtedly intended the Minerva to correspond with the temple of which she was to be not only a part, but the one most central and inspiring part.

¹ Alexander Conze, one of Germany's foremost scholars, present director of the Berlin Museum.

Doric inspiration is evidenced not only in the lines of the figure ; but equally so in the lofty expression of majesty resulting from these lines."

Conze's observation that the severe character of the composition was necessitated by the place where the statue was to stand is admirable. It would be a great error to suppose that Phidias was incapable of conceiving a statue of Minerva more in harmony with his own artistic development. The statues in the pediments of the Parthenon abundantly prove this ability. There has even been preserved a fragment of the Minerva that stood in the west pediment. This fragment, which is a part of the bust, shows a free and graceful arrangement of the ægis. It apparently crosses the breast diagonally ; a much more artistic arrangement than the division into two symmetric halves of the ægis worn by the statue within the temple. It is evident that for the statue within the temple Phidias preserved all the religious earnestness and severity of the early style ; while in the execution of the statues which were to adorn the exterior of the temple, and which had no sacred office to fill, he allowed his artistic taste its proper liberty. Even for the statue within the temple Phidias apparently allowed himself one liberty ; for the statuette is less heavily clothed than are most early statues of Minerva. Here the drapery is but a single sleeveless garment, selected undoubtedly to emphasize the youthful and virginal character of the goddess.

Finally it may be said that the simplicity and severity of the composition of the statuette not only suggest a colossal original but point to the possession of that artistic ability which would be of the greatest value in working with large masses.¹

¹ Friederichs does not refer to another fragment which is in existence and which also belonged to the Minerva of the west pediment. This fragment contains the eyes — or rather the hollows for the eyes, which were inserted and were probably gems — the forehead, and part of the hair. The forehead, and more especially the beautiful waves of hair that lie upon it, give additional force to the conclusions Friederichs draws from the first fragment.

THE MINERVA OF THE ÉCOLE DES BEAUX ARTS.

29. A colossal fragment formerly in the Villa Medici at Rome, now in the École des Beaux Arts at Paris. The head and neck, the right arm from near the shoulder, and the left arm from the elbow, are wanting. The holes about the edge of the ægis were probably for the fastening of metal serpents with which the ægis was ornamented. No complete statue of Minerva has been found sufficiently like this fragment to suggest the proper restorations. The left arm, as is indicated by the drapery, was elevated. It probably held a spear.

There is a severity and a solemnity in the style that suggest that the statue was intended to be an object of worship. Of all known statues of Minerva this one comes nearest to the Parthenon statue of Phidias as described by classic authors and still further made known by the statuette found near the Pnyx. The drapery is finer and richer than the supposed drapery of the original. The upper garment breaks in folds over the left foot. The advancing of the right foot discloses an under garment of entirely different texture; while over the left shoulder there is thrown a chlamys. These modifications are so admirably managed that they seem to increase the expression of majesty and power. The workmanship is excellent. The drapery is executed with extraordinary delicacy and grace. Still if, as asserted, the figure is of Carrara marble it must belong to the Roman period and can only be a copy.¹

VILLA ALBANI MINERVA.

30. The nude portions of the arms and the front part of the feet are restorations. The restorer probably supposed

¹ Clarac (Musée III, p. 173) states that the fragment is of Greek marble. Ingres, the celebrated French painter and who was the first to call attention to the great merits of the work, refers it to the time of Phidias.

that the statue held a spear in the right hand and a sacrificial cup in the left, though statues of this particular type hold the spear in the left hand. The type is that of the warlike Minerva. The goddess is not presented in the solemn and impressive quiet of abstract divinity. The arms have an energetic motion, and the head has a decided turning. The expression of vigor is increased by the lion's skin which the goddess wears instead of a helmet. A lion's skin was often given by Homer to his heroes to increase their formidable appearance. Art similarly decks statues of Amazons and of Diana. This statue has an especial interest from the very high esteem in which it was held by Winckelmann. From its study more than from that of any other statue he derived his knowledge of the old style and deduced his theory of its peculiar grace, "die dem Pöbel störrisch und unfreundlich scheint."¹

The figure is short and thick set. The folds of the drapery are sharp and angular. Another peculiarity of the old style is the arrangement of the upper garment. It is fastened to but one shoulder and does not cover the other. The face, with its hard and harsh expression, and the decided angle the nose makes with the forehead are archaisms. In advanced art nose and forehead form virtually one line.

Though the execution is excellent it is not of such a character as to prevent the supposition that the statue may be a copy.

THE VELLETRI MINERVA.

31. Discovered in 1797 near Velletri in the ruins of a

¹ Winckelmann at times indulges in singular criticisms. For instance; he draws a parallel between this statue and the Niobe group, stating that they are wonderful examples of the style in question; that is, of the style which is so exalted that it necessarily, according to Winckelmann, gives offence to an ordinary individual. That this statue and the Niobe group could be associated, in the mind of an art critic and be referred to the same period is extraordinary; for no two works of art can differ more widely in conception or in execution. Theories founded on such misapprehensions must be erroneous.

Roman villa ; purchased by the French Government and now in the Louvre.

With the exception of the hands the restorations are of little importance. When the statue was discovered eyes and lips bore traces of a dark violet color. This singular coloring, though faded, is still visible.

The statue held a spear in the right hand and probably a statuette of Victory in the left. The left elbow is close to the body as if the hand were sustaining a weight. If the hand held only a dish the arm would have been arranged in a freer position. Both spear and statuette were presumably of bronze. The slight bowing of the head does not indicate abstraction, but benign attention to the petition of worshippers ; for the statue was evidently an object of worship.

The execution, which is hard and dry, shows that the statue is a copy made probably during the first or second century of our era. The poor quality of the work is seen especially in the drapery. The original Greek statue must have belonged to the best period of art and to an early part of the period ; for the face though of great beauty has archaic peculiarities. It is similar to the faces of those statues of Amazons which are referred back to the time of Phidias.

The type of the head and face is by far the most beautiful of all Minerva types. The face is long, narrow, intellectual, and slightly masculine ; differing essentially from the type supposed to have been established by Phidias in his Parthenon Minerva.¹

THE FARNESE BUST OF JUNO.

32. A marble bust formerly in the Farnese collection

¹ The statue is of Parian marble, is about ten feet high, is in an admirable state of preservation, and is regarded by French critics as the most beautiful and the most impressive of all ancient statues of Minerva. I cannot agree with Friederichs in his criticisms of the execution, for the folds of the drapery are remarkably rich and the texture of the materials is finely indicated.

in Rome; since 1790 in the Naples Museum. The tip of the nose and some other small and unimportant parts are restorations.

Intractable passion is a characteristic of the Juno of Homer. This trait shows itself in scenes where Jupiter unfolds to the gods those of his plans which are favorable to the Trojans. Minerva, who hates the Trojans no less than Juno does, masters herself and maintains silence. Juno has not the same self-command, but gives fierce expression to her dissent. Though early plastic art somewhat modifies the Homeric conception; inflexibility, scorn, and contempt of self-control, are still expressed. The Farnese bust shows these traits unmodified by womanly attributes, by grace, or by gentleness. It is an admirable example of the power of Greek art to represent in its essence an accepted conception of divinity.

The character of the bust will be better appreciated by a comparison with the Ludovisi bust, in which the severity of the old style is greatly modified.

The Naples head is placed straight on the shoulders. The Ludovisi turns very slightly yet perceptibly and gently to the left. The one is without ornament; even the diadem which indicates divinity is represented with the severest simplicity. The other head has a string of pearls about it; while the diadem is ornamented with palm leaves and budding flowers, and is elevated over the centre of the forehead to make the beauty of the face more striking. Curling locks fall down on the shoulders; while the hair of the Naples bust is arranged with noticeable plainness and its execution is similar to that of archaic statues. In each head the forehead is full over the eyes to indicate energy of will, but in the Naples head there is greater fulness and the fulness begins abruptly. In the Naples head the eyes are long and narrow; their expression is heartless if not cruel. The eyelids are full and sharp. In the Ludovisi head the eyes are wide open and prominent. Their expression, if not benign, is mild and dignified. The cheeks are sufficiently full, the chin

pleasantly rounded. In the Naples head the cheeks are flat and severe, and a projecting chin adds to the expression of sternness.¹

The notion has been advanced that the Naples head was copied from, or suggested by, the celebrated gold and ivory statue of Juno by Polycletus erected near Mycenæ about 420 B.C. This is a mere supposition derived from certain resemblances to statues of Amazons which are referred to the time of Polycletus. The high position of the ears—a reminiscence of the archaic style—would point to an earlier origin; on the other hand Pausanias (2, XVII) states that on the crown of the Juno of Polycletus the Graces and Hours were represented; an ornamentation more suggestive of the Ludovisi than of the Naples bust.

That the Naples bust is but a copy may be inferred from the absence of any traces of drapery.

THE VATICAN MAIDEN RUNNER.

33. A marble statue purchased by Clement XIV from the Barberini family. The hands and part of the forearms are modern. The correctness of the restoration is questionable. The hands as restored convey an idea of surprise, an idea hardly in keeping with the very evident character of the statue.

At Olympia foot-races by virgins were held in honor of Juno. The maidens wore a garment that fell a little

¹ Friederichs should have continued his comparison still further. In the Naples head the mouth is the most striking feature. Its intense, yet intensely beautiful, expression of scorn is one of the marvels of Greek sculpture. In the Ludovisi Juno the mouth has beautiful lines but its expression is ordinary. The Naples Juno is incomparably superior as a work of art. It excites admiration and sympathy. There is over the face a shade of suffering. The bust suggests that if the Queen of Olympus were stern and revengeful, she was not so by nature but became so by the slights and infidelities of her liege lord. Later artists, by their milder conceptions, destroyed Juno's true character, divested her of individuality, and made her a commonplace nonentity.

below the knee. Their hair was unbound, and the right shoulder to the breast was bare. The *victrix* received a palm branch, a portion of the sacrificial meat, and was honored with a statue bearing on its base a commemorative inscription. The existence of such contests explains the Vatican statue, even though the garment be not exactly the one called for by the regulations. The deviations are so slight, however, as to be quite within the limits of artistic license. By making the garment shorter the artist has the more strongly characterized the runner, who must be free in all her movements. In accordance with Spartan fashion the garment is open on one side. This opening may have been prescribed at Olympia. There is but little fulness to hide form or to impede flight. A broad girdle binds the garment close to the person.

The form of the maiden is as characteristic of the runner as is her garment. It is without womanly fulness. Shoulders are strong; chest is full; hips are narrow; thighs and legs, large and muscular. Still the figure is slight and most graceful.

The maiden is represented in the very moment of starting. The head and body are slightly bent forward, the right foot has already left the ground. The hands should have been restored so as to correspond with the intensity and concentration of the whole figure. The face shows this concentration most beautifully blended with girlish modesty and joyousness.

The olive-branch on the support clearly indicates that the maiden was victorious, and that the statue was erected to commemorate a victory. It may have stood at Olympia or, if an original, more probably in the place where the maiden dwelt; for the rule of Olympia prescribed that commemorative statues should be of bronze. If the statue be a copy, the bronze original may be imagined without the supports under the right foot and by the left thigh; a change that would make the impression still more light and delicate. It may be inferred from this

work that the commemorative statues at Olympia were not merely symbolical and motionless figures, but that each victor was represented engaged in the contest in which he had been successful.

The execution points to the middle of the fifth century when the peculiarities of the old style had not been entirely discarded. The position of the ears, the form of the eyes, and some of the lines of the face, are archaic reminiscences. The whole figure is not entirely free from the circumscribing limitations of the old style.

The statue is not Attic in character. It may have emanated from one of the art schools of the Peloponnesus to which may have been entrusted the execution of Olympian commemorative statues.

THE PHIDIAN AMAZON OF THE VATICAN.

34. A marble statue formerly in the Villa Mattei; since the time of Clement XIV in the Vatican.

The right leg with the exception of the foot, both arms, the nose, the chin, and the under lip, are restorations. The head was found broken off. Formerly there were traces of color on the drapery. On the pedestal is an antique inscription: "*Translata de schola medicorum.*"

The motive of the statue has been the subject of much dispute.

A widely accepted notion was that the Amazon is in the act of taking her bow from her shoulder, and of depositing it with the other weapons which lie at her feet: the idea being that she is conquered and is in the act of surrender. Her expression of sadness and dejection accords with this idea. To carry it out the restorer has placed in each hand an end of the bow. Apart from the awkwardness of such a position, it is evident from comparison with other statues, and it will appear from a closer examination of this statue itself, that the bow was not carried over the left shoulder. The oriental custom, and the custom which art the most frequently attributed

to Amazons, was to wear the bow hung below the quiver. If the quiver of this statue be examined, it will be found that under it there are indications of straps with which to bind the bow, and that along its under side there is a projection which, if it had not been smoothed down by the restorer, would still more easily be recognized as a piece of the bow itself.

Another notion has been that the Amazon was without action but stood in repose, the right arm resting on the head. Apart from the fact that there are no marks on the head to show that such was the position, the attitude of the body and the action of the legs do not indicate repose; on the contrary they indicate extreme discomfort. The position is very apparently one that required a support. According to an antique gem on which is engraved an identical figure, this support was given by a long spear upon which the Amazon rested with both hands; the right hand grasping it above her head, the left holding it by her side. (Laurent Natier: "Traité de la méthode antique de graver en pierres fines, etc., etc.," pl. 31.)

From the statues of Amazons which have been preserved, at least three types may be selected which are referable to the time of Phidias. These three are so alike in motive, size, and action, as to suggest the existence of some extrinsic reason for the resemblance. All the types represent Amazons in grief. Attitude and expression excite pity. Sometimes a wound is shown to increase commiseration. The drapery is much alike in all. The right arm is always raised, while the left is down by the side.

Pliny speaks of a competition entered into by several artists of the time of Phidias for statues of Amazons to be used for the adornment of the temple of Diana at Ephesus. In this competition, according to Pliny, Polycleetus was first, Phidias second, and Kresilas third. (Pliny, N.H. xxxiv, 19.)

Accepting this account, it may be that the three types in question were established by these three artists. If the

additional tradition be also accepted that the theme assigned to the artists was the refuge secured by the Amazons in the temple when defeated and pursued by Bacchus, the character of these types and their similarity is easily understood.

In classic descriptions two of the statues are particularly commended; the one, of an Amazon exhibiting her wound; the other, of an Amazon leaning on her spear (Lucian, *Imagg.* 4). Of these two the latter is attributed to Phidias. The statue in question is probably a copy of the Amazon by Phidias. The originals were all in bronze. That this statue is copied from the bronze is evident from the wiry character of the hair. Such treatment of hair appeared in bronze long after it had been discontinued in marble. The copyist preserved the bronze treatment to testify to the accuracy of his copy.

About the left ankle is the band for holding the spur.¹ Among the arms which the tired refugee has deposited at her feet are a helmet of Greek pattern and a shield of a late design. The Amazon shields which appear on the friezes of the Niké Temple, the Mausoleum, and the Temple of Apollo at Phygalia, are larger and have one semi-circular indention instead of the two of this shield. The copyist may have followed his own notions in these details instead of copying after the bronze original.²

¹ As stirrups are supposed not to have been used by the ancients, who vaulted on their horses from the left side, no spur was worn on the right heel for fear of the injury that might be inflicted while mounting and dismounting.

² A less beautiful but equally interesting copy is in the Capitol at Rome. The face is more archaic. The whole figure is not far removed from the dry style of early periods. The restoration is the same except that the restorer has added the entire bow. This is the more surprising because the left hand, which is antique, has not the necessary position for holding a bow, and the indications of a bow along the under side of the quiver are unmistakable. The Amazon type of Phidias may be best understood from a study of these two statues.

WOUNDED AMAZON OF THE VATICAN.

35. A supposed copy from Kresilas. In Pliny's account of the competition, to which reference has already been made, it is stated that the third rank was assigned to Kresilas. In another paragraph Pliny mentions that an artist named Ctesilaüs, made a statue of a man fainting from his wounds. The Bamberg manuscript of Pliny gives "Cresilas" instead of "Ctesilaüs." Still further along in the same chapter Pliny mentions "Desilaüs" as having made a Doryphoros and a wounded Amazon. The name Desilaüs occurs among the "C's" in an enumeration of artists which is apparently alphabetical. The conclusions drawn are, that in each instance Pliny referred to the same artist, that the artist was Kresilas, that the Amazon Kresilas executed for the Temple of Diana was wounded, and that of the statues of wounded Amazons found in the Museums of Europe some may represent the type thus established. Of this type, the one in the Vatican is a beautiful example. The right arm, the left forearm, a part of the left breast, and portions of the legs, are restorations.

From the extant copies little idea can be formed of the relative merits of the originals. The statue attributed to Kresilas is more realistic than the one assigned to Phidias in that sympathy is sought to be excited by the exhibition of a wound. There is, however, a beautiful delicacy in the manner in which the garment is removed to disclose the wound. If judgment may be formed from the copies, the statue of Phidias excelled in nobility and strength; that of Kresilas in gentleness and womanly attractiveness. There are minor differences between the two which do not affect their merit. The Kresilas statue rests the weight of the body on the left leg instead of on the right; the right breast is exposed instead of the left: it moreover wears an outer garment which, fastened about the neck, falls behind to below the knees. No band for a spur appears on the left ankle.

AMAZON OF THE VATICAN.

36. Supposed copy from Polyclethus. A marble statue belonging to the collection formed by Pius VII.¹

The spirit of investigation and the learning of the elder Camuccini² rescued many a precious marble from obscurity — the precursor of destruction. The statue of a tired and grief-stricken Amazon claims a prominent and an honored position among them. Though the arms and parts of the legs have been restored, and though the statue has received many injuries, it still offers fine artistic enjoyment. The noble features of the face seem to express the pain that accompanies grief. This expression makes it hardly possible that the Amazon could have been conceived in combat or even in the act of preparing herself for combat.

The right hand and arm are raised, not in energetic action, but to emphasize complaint. In some copies the hand rests on the head in a position which may be still more appropriate to the expressing of the dejection and utter hopelessness resulting from a complete defeat. Whether in addition to her mental affliction the Amazon be also suffering from a wound is not easily decided. The face would almost suggest such a motive, for it is full of suffering. Still it shows that self-control which suppresses the expression of physical suffering and only permits the expression of the moral and the mental. In all probability this precious marble is a copy of a statue by Kresilas, a younger contemporary, if not a pupil, of Phidias. The type attributed to Kresilas, where there is an actual and material representation of a wound, must

¹ The following description is taken from Emil Braun's "Die Ruinen und Museen, Roms." It will be seen that Braun does not accept the views so far advanced. He attributed this statue to Kresilas, and assigns the wounded Amazon to a far later art period. Braun's description is given partially to make the reader acquainted with one of Germany's most famous art-writers.

² The Camuccini lived and published in Rome during the early part of the present century.

be referred to a later and a degenerate art period. The style of the school of Phidias is seen not only in the noble and broad treatment of the features and of the nude portions of the body, but in the hair; and especially in the delicacy of the finely broken drapery, of which the charmingly detailed beauty makes a most original contrast with the simple magnificence of the nude. The larger masses of the drapery give in reëchoing tones the underlying thought that controlled the conception of the pose and action of the figure, while the tender and fleeting sensibilities of the womanly Amazon are reflected in the delicate and evanescent folds of the material that clothes her.

In nearly all existing antique statues of Amazons the right arm is raised and one breast is bare. The motive however, which underlies this rendering varies. It seems as if artists had been engaged in copying some one celebrated work of art; and that while faithfully giving the action, they had allowed themselves the liberty of attributing it to various motives.

If among the fifty Amazon statues which adorned the porch of the Temple of Diana at Ephesus there were no greater differences than those which can be found in the existing statues, it may very well be that the same motive governed the entire fifty. A more critical examination of all the statues in existence, than has yet been made, could not fail to throw more light on a perplexing though delightful question.

In the mean time the true lover of art may satisfy himself with the beauty of these extraordinary works. He should particularly observe the wonderful manner in which they present grief unmixed with pathos; dejection unalloyed by weakness. A study of the pure and abstract ethical expression of the faces of these Amazons may help to a higher appreciation of the now, alas, headless divinities of the pediments of the Parthenon.¹

¹Since Braun's description was published (1854), the Amazon statues have been carefully studied by many art-writers of Europe. Differences of opinion still exist; but the type of which the statue in

*THE NEAPOLITAN COPY OF THE DORYPHOROS OF
POLYCLETUS.*

37. A marble statue found in Herculaneum; now in the Naples Museum. The hands are modern. The left hand undoubtedly held a spear which rested on the left shoulder and touched the head at a point indicated by a protuberance. The statue is without action. It is simply a characteristic representation of a young warrior. The form shows strength and agility, and the spear which the imagination must supply suggests the use to which these qualities were put.

There is a certain thickness and shortness that recall archaic art. The face, too, is old-fashioned; so is the hair, which later art worked more fully out. The hair is also wiry as if copied from bronze.

It is highly probable that this statue is a copy in marble of a celebrated bronze by Polycletus. The large number of copies in existence points to a celebrated original; and Polycletus is reported to have made two statues in bronze to represent, the one strength, the other effeminacy; the one a youthful warrior bearing a spear (Doryphoros), the other an effeminate youth binding a fillet about his head (Diadumenos.)¹

question is an example is generally assigned to Polycletus. The type has certain marked distinctions. The left breast is entirely bare, the right one partially so. The drapery is better ordered than in the other types. Below the waist it is divided into two symmetrical parts: it is richer than that of the wounded Amazon, and is freed by its harmony from the affectation apparent in the drapery of the Phidian Amazon. The drapery of this latter statue excites doubts of its authenticity; for in the statues of the pediments of the Parthenon Phidias shows himself to be a consummate master of drapery. Though the Vatican copy be inferior as a copy, it makes it easy to understand how the first rank in the competition could have been assigned to Polycletus.

¹There are better copies in Florence, Rome, and Cassel. The Doryphoros is supposed to illustrate the canon Polycletus is reported to have established for the human figure. By this canon dimensions of parts are multiples or factors of a certain unit of measurement, so that the unit being given the whole figure could be constructed. Some writers assert that the Doryphoros was the canon itself.

BRITISH MUSEUM COPY OF THE DIADUMENOS OF POLYCLETUS.

38. [A marble statue formerly in the Villa Farnese in Rome, now in the British Museum in London.]

The statue has been admirably preserved. The nose, the forefinger of the left hand, and a few bits of the fillet, are the only restorations. The statue represents a youth binding a fillet about his head. The fillet has been crossed behind and brought around in front of the head. The youth holds an end in either hand. Both hands are about the same distance from the head and at about the same elevation. This symmetrical elevation of the arms leaves the front and back of the figure fully exposed. If the Doryphoros were executed for the purpose of illustrating the canon it may very well be that this figure was executed as an illustration of the proper treatment of anatomical development. Friederichs' theory about the origin of the two statues, though generally accepted, has met with opposition. Overbeck (*Geschichte der Griechischen Plastik*, Part I, p. 344 and notes) presents both sides of the question. The Diadumenos is certainly not effeminate; and if the carvings on the support are palm leaves, the statue must be that of a victorious athlete binding about his head the fillet of victory. — *Ed.*]

THE DRESDEN ATHLETE.

(From Dr. Hermann Hettner's Catalogue of 1875, No. 291.)

39. A marble statue in the Dresden Museum; formerly in the Chigi collection.

H. 1.72. The head, the neck, and the right arm, are wanting. The right leg from the knee down, and portions of the left knee and foot, are new. The trunk of a tree against which the right leg rests is antique.

The statue represents an athlete anointing himself with oil. In the elevated right hand a vessel was held

from which oil was being poured into the left hand which is close to the body to receive it. On the trunk of the tree is a strigil and also an oil vessel. The projecting breast, the square shoulders, the hollow back, and the large buttocks, are suggestive of archaic art. For these reasons, and because in copies where the head still exists a resemblance is seen to the features of the Doryphoros, the statue is referred back to one of the many athlete-types supposed to have been established by Polycletus. The celebrity of the original is attested by the number of copies still in existence. Among others, there are two in the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, two small ones in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican, one in the Palazzo Mattei in Rome, and one in the collection of the Earl of Egremont at Petworth, England. The same figure appears on reliefs, gems, etc., etc.

THE DISKOBOLOS OR DISCUS-THROWER OF MYRON.

40. [There are several marble statues in existence which are supposed to be copies of this celebrated bronze. One is in the Vatican, one in the Palazzo Massimi alle Colonne in Rome, and one in the British Museum, London. Of these three, the one in the Massimi palace is by far the best in execution, and supposedly the best copy of the original. It represents a youth in the very act of throwing the discus. Held in the right hand the discus is swung back to the extreme point from which to make the throw. The force of the backward swing bends the body and partially turns it and the head to the right. The left foot is in the act of leaving the ground in order to be ready for the forward movement of the body which will follow the throw. The artist has sought the one instant of suspense between two most violent actions. The copy in the Massimi palace was found on the Esquiline hill in 1761. The copy in the Vatican was found in 1791 in the ruins of Hadrian's Villa near Tivoli. Of the Vatican copy, the head, the left arm, and the left leg from

the knee down, are modern. The head is wrongly placed on the body, being turned directly down to the ground. In the London copy where the head is, I believe, antique but broken off and replaced, the same mistake has been committed. If the head had not been momentarily turned by the force of the backward swing the eyes would have remained fixed on the goal. In no case would they seek the ground. Lucian's notion (*The Liars*, § 18) that the eyes are turned towards the attendant who has just brought the discus is ridiculous. Myron is classified by writers with the ablest sculptors of antiquity, and is especially celebrated for having led the way from the old style into the new by imparting decided action to his figures. As in bronze the support would have been unnecessary, the figure would have had a still livelier appearance.

There are other statues of discus-throwers that are evidently copies of some one other equally famous original. In this type the thrower still holds the discus in the left hand, and is apparently calculating the distance he has to cover in his throw. This type is referred by some writers to Alcámenes, a pupil of Phidias, by others to Naucydes, who flourished about 375 B.C. As Friederichs does not accept the first theory his description of the statue comes later.—*Ed.*]

THE SILENUS OF MYRON.

41. A marble statue found in 1820 on the Esquiline hill by L. Vescovali.¹

Where the statue was found there had evidently been a stone-cutter's establishment. Blocks of marble, partially sawed, were discovered; hands and heads in various stages of finish; and finally eleven statues, evidently copies; among them the one in question.

¹ Luigi Vescovali, a celebrated Roman archæologist of the first part of the present century.

The statue was at first in the Vatican, but since 1852 it has been one of the chief ornaments of the Lateran collection. The arms have been incorrectly restored; they should give intensity to an expression of astonishment.

The figure is quite probably copied from a group by Myron. The original work included a statue of Minerva throwing away the flute at which the satyr is gazing in astonishment. There is in existence a relief upon which appears not only this figure but also that of Minerva, and from which the action of the original group may be learned. The artist represented Minerva at the moment when, disgusted by the effects on her beauty of her efforts to use the instrument, she in anger throws it from her and rushes off. Marsyas, who has been attracted by the sound, draws back in terror at the sudden movement of the goddess, but still keeps his eyes fixed on the instrument. This is the motive of the statue in the Lateran. One can perceive how stealthily and on tiptoe the satyr has approached, and that his present scare is only momentary. He has no intention of leaving the flute. As in the original bronze all supports were away, the figure was actually balanced on its toes. Myron is reported to have delighted in such lively and fleeting situations as the one here represented. The slight and agile form of the satyr is excellently given. The face is highly characteristic and comic. The expression of bewilderment in the elevated eyebrows is admirably rendered. A characteristic of Myron is seen in the want of finish to the hair and beard. He was accused of this particular carelessness. Still in this statue a more finished treatment would not have been in keeping.¹

¹ There is quite a diversity of opinions on the points advanced in Friederichs' description. For authorities see note 128, Overbeck's *Geschichte der Griechischen Plastik*, Book II. An admirable small bronze of this figure is in the British Museum.

BUST OF PERICLES.

42. A marble bust found in 1781 in the so-called Villa of Cassius near Tivoli. It was at first in the possession of Gavin Hamilton. It then belonged to the Towneley collection, and is now in the British Museum. The nose and a few bits of the helmet are modern.

According to Plutarch Pericles' only physical defect was a singularly long (high? — *Ed.*) head. For this reason, presumably, nearly all statues and busts of Pericles wear the helmet; the artist by its use intending to conceal the hero's one ugliness. According to another supposition the helmet indicates the rank of the wearer as commander-in-chief of the Athenian forces. The former supposition is, however, the more plausible because Pericles though a good strategist was not a noted warrior, excelling chiefly as a civilian. The character of the head is ideal and gentle, not strong or determined. Noticeable is the slight turning of the head to one side; a movement quite in keeping with the character.

The influences of the old style are seen in the eyes, the short curled hair, the very close beard, and the position of the ears. The bust, or its original if it be a copy, must be assigned to the fifth century B.C. and to the latter part of the century; for it represents Pericles in fully ripened manhood. Kresilas, already known to the reader by his statue of the Wounded Amazon, is reported to have executed a statue of Pericles, and critics claim to recognize in the bust the technique of the Amazon. Pliny, in speaking of a statue by Kresilas of the "Olympian" Pericles, which may be the original of the bust under consideration (N. H., xxxiv, 19), adds: "One thing to be admired in this art (*i.e.*, the art of portraiture) is that it renders noble men more noble." This remark applies admirably to early portraiture, of which this bust is an excellent specimen.¹

¹ This bust is one of the most interesting of antiquity. It goes back

THE COLOSSALS OF MONTE CAVALLLO.

43. Marble groups in the Piazza del Quirinale, or di Monte Cavallo, Rome. Formerly these works stood in front of the Thermæ of Constantine as appears from an inscription executed at the time of the removal. The inscription is as follows: "Sextus V pont. max. colossea hæc signa temporis vi deformata restituit veteribusque repositis inscriptionibus e proximis constantianis thermis in quirinalem aream transtulit anno salutis MDLXXXIX pontificatus quarto." "Pope Sextus V restored these colossal statues injured by the ravages of time, and having, moreover, renewed the ancient inscriptions, he removed the statues themselves to this place on the Quirinal hill from the neighboring Thermæ of Constantine." The restorations referred to were especially necessary in the horses, and chiefly in the horse attributed to Phidias, of which little more than the head and left side are antique. The old inscriptions which Sextus renewed or copied are on the pedestals and proclaim the groups to be respectively by Phidias and Praxiteles.

The groups are supposed to represent Castor and Pollux, each in the act of taming, or correcting, a steed. The Swedish sculptor Fogelberg in a most close, exhaustive, and conclusive, work has settled several vexed questions relating to the original positions occupied by these works. In the first place it is evident that the statues of Castor and Pollux were not free-standing; for on the backs there are rough unhewn masses which would be still more conspicuous if the restorations had not reduced them. Similar rough places exist on the stands of arms by the side of the statues which serve as

to the beginnings of portraiture. It is a capital example of the elimination of those small personal details which do not affect character. It shows the power of true art to enhance and idealize character without the sacrifice of individuality. It supplies the defects of history by giving an admirable representation of Athens' most cultured statesman.

supports. These supports were originally alike, the addition to the larger one being very evidently modern. Again, it is evident that the inner sides of the horses were rough and unfinished; the finishing being part of the modern restoration. This is particularly evident from the horse attributed to Praxiteles, as the exact spot on the side of the horse can be seen where the restorer began to chisel off the rough masses. It follows that the figures must have stood in high relief against a wall. Parts of the surface of the wall may even be recognized about the ends of the falling drapery of each figure. The parts were probably left as supports when the figures were removed. Moreover, on the shoulder-blades of the figures are round holes filled with marble. These holes were undoubtedly for the metal pins which attached the upper part of the statues to the wall, and were filled with marble when the statues were moved. All the restorations appear to have been necessitated by putting the statues in a place where they would be seen from all sides. Some artists would exchange the places of the horses; because, though they were evidently intended to be represented as held by bridles, they turn their heads away from the hands holding the bridles. Fogelberg remarks that such is the case with all horses that are not thoroughly tamed; and that the artist's intentions were undoubtedly to represent horses which, if not entirely untamed, were still offering energetic opposition to the efforts to subdue them. Moreover, if the change were made, the unfinished side of the horse would in each case be the outer and exposed one.

Fogelberg concludes that the groups were against the walls which formed the entrance to some building, each figure at right angles to a horse and at the very entrance corners; the figures being along the walls, the horses along the entrance. The present arrangement of the groups is therefore substantially correct. Fogelberg would however put each horse further back and closer to his tamer,

so that the advancing foot of the latter would partially hide the support of the former. The absence of an inner side to the pedestal supporting the horse attributed to Praxiteles would indicate that the pedestal was here met, or hidden, by the foot of the tamer.

The Dioscuri, whom the statues represent, are therefore to be thought of as colossal sentries, or guardians. In the hands not occupied with the bridles they carried spears. The holes in the heads were for the insertion of metal stars, by which the Dioscuri were distinguished. The general type of the figures is also indicative of these divinities, who were stalwart young horsemen. Their faces are noble, while the hair rising from the forehead is according to Winckelmann a sure sign of divine sonship from Jupiter. The poets, too, often speak of Castor and Pollux as guardians of house and temple.

The horses are small in comparison with the figures.

This may be accounted for on that principle of the old style, to which reference has already been made, by which the importance of principal figures was preserved even at the expense of truth. Here in addition existed the architectural necessity of making the two parts of the masses balance one another.

Though the figures correspond in style, a decided preference must be given to the one ascribed to Phidias. The impression made by the other one is undoubtedly injured by the uneven modern pedestal on which it stands. Still, in the expression of the head and in the arrangement of the drapery, it is inferior. The head of the figure ascribed to Phidias is full of strength and life. The other is weak and has a mask-like appearance. The drapery of the former figure falls in grand and simple lines; while the drapery of the other, which is gathered about the lowered arm, shows details which, though rich, do not harmonize with the conception. A harmonious arrangement of the drapery could perhaps not have been obtained; for as the garments must depend from the left arm to leave

the arm of action free and as in this figure the left arm is lowered, there was but little room for length and simplicity of line.

The supporting stands of arms are of Roman pattern. At least the extension of the breastplate to cover the stomach is entirely opposed to early Greek ideas; so also the tassel-like ornaments about the shoulders and elsewhere. From this style of armor it is evident, either that the statues are Roman copies, or that they were removed and reërected during the Roman period. The only object of the stand of arms is to support; for the Dioscuri are always represented without armor. It may be that the originals were in bronze, and that the supports were first introduced when the bronze figures were repeated in marble. According to the learned sculptor, Martin Wagner, the heads suggest bronze originals; for the hair is wiry and the walls of the nose are very thin.

To what period shall the originals be assigned? The Latin inscriptions which refer the works to Phidias and Praxiteles cannot be regarded as authority. The use of names which suggest the best efforts of Greek art hardly indicates more than that in these works the highest excellence was recognized. Still the judgment of such artists as Canova, Carstens, and Thorwaldsen, fortifies judgment in assigning them to the best period of Greek sculpture. Attention has been called to the fact that the action of the figure assigned to Phidias is the same as that of a youth on the frieze of the Parthenon. This resemblance, though it may be accidental, is suggestive.

The originals may be safely placed from 450 to 400 B.C. The grandeur of the conception points to Phidias. The lively expression and the peculiarity of the technique are rather of the school of Lysippus.

That the figure of each Dioscurus is of a single block of marble is a further indication of the importance of the work.

Temple Sculpture.

*METOPES FROM THE TEMPLE OF JUPITER AT
OLYMPIA IN ELIS.*

44. A number of fragments discovered during the military expedition of France to Greece in 1829. The discovery was made by Messieurs Dubois and Blouet, who had charge of the scientific commission attached to the expedition. All the larger pieces were discovered to the rear of the site of the temple. The fragments are now in the Louvre.

Pausanias, in his description of the temple (V, 10), states that over the doors of entrance were representations of the labors of Hercules; over the door in the front of the temple, the adventures with the Erymanthian boar, with the horses of Diomedes, with Geryon, with Atlas, and the cleaning of the Augean stables; over the door in the rear of the temple, the combat with the Amazons, the capture of the hind and of the Cretan steer, and the destruction of the Stymphalian birds, the Lernæan hydra, and the Nemean lion.

The fragment from the representation of the capture of the Cretan bull is the largest of those in the Louvre and gives so much of the scene that the action is clear. With his left hand Hercules holds down the head of the steer by the horns; while he strikes with the club, uplifted in his right.

Of the contest with the Nemean lion, so much has been preserved that the action can be fairly made out. The fore and hind parts of the lion were discovered. These represent the animal as already dead. On his shoulder is a right foot. Just in front of his hind leg is a portion of the left leg of Hercules; and against the lion's back, a portion of a club. Hercules was, therefore, standing with his right foot on the lion he had just killed, his left was on the ground, and he was further resting on his

club. A large fragment of the fight with Geryon, from the front of the temple, was also secured. The fragment unfortunately consists principally of Geryon's large round shield. Some of his person is recognized below the shield, also the left leg and foot of Hercules, the toes apparently turned up against Geryon's person.¹

Another figure in the Louvre is that of a female seated on a rock. As the edge of the outer garment she wears is similar to the edge frequently given by art to the ægis the figure is supposed to be Minerva, though there is nothing in attitude or expression to indicate a goddess. On old monuments Minerva is frequently represented present at the labors of Hercules. In later art this place is taken by a local nymph, to whom this sitting attitude seems more appropriate. If the figure be Minerva, the right hand may have held a spear.²

That these reliefs were intended to fill metopes appears from the character of their execution. The relief is so high as to require projecting flanking triglyphs. Except for the recesses of metopes such relief would not have been selected. Whether the metopes on the outside of the portico, or those within the portico and over the entrance to the Pronaos and the Opisthodomos, were the ones decorated by these reliefs, is still a question. The text of Pausanias is not sufficiently definite to decide the point.

¹ Friederichs and other writers make more out of this fragment than appears. The ordinary observer will have difficulty in perceiving the three bodies of Geryon, or that Hercules has one of these bodies by the head. Fragments that are so far gone may be interesting as archæological puzzles, but they are valueless in the study of art.

² The ugliness of the conception and of the execution of this figure cannot escape attention. The pose is strained and undignified, the drapery is badly managed and the protruding of the naked feet from beneath the skirt is a disagreeable motive. This figure suggests the idea that in Greece artistic ability and power of appreciation were not universal but local. This idea will be strengthened when those statues are inspected which have been lately discovered at Olympia. It is quite upsetting of preconceptions of the Greeks to find that the principal temple of all Greece was ornamented by statues that are unworthy of artistic consideration.

The reliefs were colored, probably to correspond with the coloring of the building. The steer is still of a reddish-brown and the lion of a yellowish-brown. The figure of Hercules when first disinterred bore traces of color which have since disappeared.

These reliefs were probably executed about the 86th Ol.; for it was then that Phidias was employed in constructing the gold and ivory statue of Jupiter within the temple, and his two pupils, Alcamanes and Paionios, were occupied with the statues in the pediments. A much later date cannot be given to them on account of the archaic peculiarities. These peculiarities are seen in the drapery of Minerva, and conspicuously in the face of Hercules, which is archaic in form and still preserves the smile of very early sculpture.

It may be supposed that they were executed by some one of Phidias' pupils, though there is nothing in the style to suggest Attic art; for it is heavy, hard, dry, and graceless. Though a pupil of Phidias the artist cannot have been an Athenian. As the architect of the temple was from Elis, these subordinate works may also have been entrusted to a native artist.¹

¹ Since 1875 excavations at Olympia have been steadily pursued by Prussia, acting under a contract with the government of Greece. One more metope has been recovered and in a comparatively uninjured condition. It represents Hercules standing between Atlas and one of the Hesperides. Hercules bends his head beneath a cushion upon which is supposed to rest the heavens. Atlas approaches with the apples of the Hesperides; and the female figure, supposed to be one of the Hesperides, extends her hand as if to assist Hercules in bearing his burden. The composition is stiff and conventional; the execution severe and without grace.

Many fragments of the groups that stood in the pediments have been found. The grouping of the front pediment has been substantially made out and the character of the work well established.

The description left by Pausanias has been so exactly verified that, with a few interjected explanations, it may be repeated as written:

"In the front pediment of the temple is represented the equestrian contest of Pelops and Œnomaüs, each preparing himself for the course. In the centre stands Jupiter; to his right Œnomaüs, helmeted, and his wife Serope who was one of the daughters of Atlas. Then Myrtilus, the charioteer of Œnomaüs, seated in front of his horses.

[Friederichs, after the example of other writers on the Fine Arts, describes and criticises the metopes and the frieze of the temple of Theseus in Athens. A careful examination of these works, which are still on the temple,

The horses are four in number. They stand facing the centre of the pediment and are attached to a chariot. After Myrtilus (horses, chariot, etc.) are two men whose names are not given, but who appear to be those who took charge of the horses. At the end of the pediment, the river Cladeus is represented; for this river is honored by the Eleians next to the Alpheus. On the left hand of the statue of Jupiter, Pelopes and Hippodamia are represented, then the chariot-eer of Pelops, the horses and chariot, two grooms, and finally a representation of the river Alpheus. All this is the work of Paionios of Mende in Thrace."

To judge from the parts recovered, the central figures stood in a row without action: Jupiter overtopping the others by about half a head. The two charioteers were seated on stools facing the central group and directly under their horses' heads. The four grooms were squatted on the ground; and the river gods, ungracefully reclining. The composition is formal and severe, the individual figures, though technically correct, are without grace or beauty. The squatted figures are decidedly ugly. Paionios, who may have been a clever workman and a faithful student, was without imagination or artistic invention. These statues are, I believe, still in a temporary museum erected near the site of the temple. Plaster casts are in Berlin and some (1881) in the Museum of the Fine Arts in Boston.

Of the works in the other pediment Pausanias writes as follows:

"All that is on the pediment in the rear of the temple is the work of Alcamenes, who lived at the same time as Phidias and was next to him in the art of making statues. Here are represented the Lapithæ fighting with the Centaurs at the marriage of Pirithoüs. In the centre is Pirithoüs, near him Eurytion attempting to abduct the wife of Pirithoüs and Cæneus assisting Pirithoüs. In another part is seen Theseus avenging himself on the Centaurs with an axe; and there are two Centaurs, one of whom carries away a virgin, and the other a boy in the flower of his youth. It appears to me that Alcamenes made these because he learned from the poems of Homer that Pirithoüs was the son of Jupiter, and because he knew that Theseus was the fourth in descent from Pelops."

Of these works many fragments have been found, but, with the exception of the figure of Pirithoüs, the fragments are too imperfect to admit of anything but a conjectural restoration, and no judgment can be given of the excellence of the technique. The head of Pirithoüs is without expression and very archaic. It has the formal arrangement of hair of early statues of Apollo, and was at first supposed to be the head of an archaic statue of that god. Its identity has been established.

Until the excavations have been completed and the statues so placed that they can be carefully studied no satisfactory and ultimate judgment can be reached. I have seen the plaster casts only, and confess

has satisfied me that, for the art-student, they are too badly damaged to be profitable objects of study. I do not recall a single head that has recognizable features; and many of the figures are not only headless, but armless and legless. Only with the help of a vivid imagination can individuals and their occupations be distinguished, or technical beauty be recognized. When works of art have reached such a degree of disintegration their deciphering may be entertaining and may yield valuable archæological information, but they have no place in a course of profitable art-study.

The curious will find in the ninth volume of the "Marbles of the British Museum," drawings and descriptions of these marbles. — *Ed.*]

THE SCULPTURE OF THE PARTHENON.

45. In 1674 the Marquis de Nointel, French Ambassador to the Porte, employed an artist named Jacques Carrey to make drawings of the Parthenon. According to these drawings the exterior sculpture of the building was at the time substantially intact with the exception of the central statues of the east pediment and two statues of the

that these not only gave me great disappointment, but have quite upset long entertained and cherished theories of the orderly and universal development of Greek sculpture.

The late efforts of German writers to make these statues harmonize with preconceived theories are not satisfactory. If their chronology be correct, they destroy the link that connected Phidias with Praxiteles, and independent sources of development must also be sought for the schools of Scopas and Lysippus. Even the statue of Victory by Paionios, which stood in front of the temple on a three-cornered pillar and which has been recovered, does not deserve the praises lavished upon it. It is but a mannered copy of a type which, according to present information, was established by Phidias in his statue of Victory in the pediment of the Parthenon. In technique, it is similar to the so-called Iris from the same pediment of the Parthenon.

The group of Mercury and the infant Bacchus, also discovered at Olympia during the late excavation, will be considered with the other works of Praxiteles its author. It is the most valuable addition made to Greek art since the discovery of the Venus of Milo, whose parentage and family it seems to establish.

west pediment. It may be presumed, therefore, that the Parthenon and its sculpture were reasonably preserved down to 1687, the year of the Venetian bombardment.

Carrey's drawings, preserved in the State Library at Paris, are of special importance because they were taken before the Venetian bombardment. They contain some errors which must be attributed, in part at least, to the fact that Carrey had no scaffolding. The number of the drawings and the ability displayed are remarkable, when it is considered that the artist's stay in Athens did not exceed a month.

During the Venetian siege the temple, which the Turks were using as a magazine, was struck by a bomb. The explosion which ensued destroyed all the centre of the temple with the metopes and the portions of the frieze attached to it. The western gable was severely injured, but the remains of the eastern escaped; as Carrey's drawings testify. Late excavations have disclosed a few fragments that must have fallen from the eastern pediment before Carrey's time, so that there is more to it now than was seen by that artist.

During the early years of the present century nearly all the extant marbles of the Parthenon were removed from the building and sent to England by Lord Elgin, the English Ambassador to the Porte. In 1815 they were purchased for the British Museum, and still constitute its chief treasure.

THE PEDIMENTS.

THE EAST PEDIMENT.

As already stated, only the corners of this pediment have been preserved. In it, according to Pausanias, the birth of Minerva was represented. How the scene was ordered can only be conjectured. It is not supposable

that Minerva, in doll-like size, was emerging from the head of Jupiter as the scene is so often depicted on early vases. She undoubtedly appeared of full size and of terrifying aspect. So the poets describe her when singing of her birth, and so alone would the scene have been worthy of the goddess and worthy of the building. Moreover the expression and action of the figures that remain presuppose such a scene; for they show that astonishment, bordering on fright, was the motive of the composition. In no way could Phidias have honored Minerva more than by surrounding her with the wondering and amazed divinities of Olympus.

As in the pediments of the temple of Ægina, so here, the necessary grading of figures is principally accomplished by changing attitudes from the upright to the recumbent. This was not the only method followed in ancient times. In pediments of Lycian and of Etruscan origin figures were accommodated to the varying heights of pediments by varying their size: a very simple but very inartistic method, producing comical contrast between the colossal figures of the centre and the doll-like figures of the ends. There was also produced an impression of space as a controlling element.

The figures in the pediments of the Parthenon do indeed differ in size; but this difference is not so great as to destroy homogeneousness, or so marked as to produce the impression that space was the controlling principle.¹

As already stated all the centre of the pediment has disappeared. Of the statues preserved, the one that stood nearest to the centre is probably represented by a fragment discovered in 1836 during the excavations conducted under the supervision of Prof. Ross. The

¹ The difference in the size of the figures is true to a correct art principle. Space should not dominate, but it should be recognized; and it is recognized by making the central figures larger than the outer ones. Moreover, a figure of a given size would appear to be smaller in the centre than it would towards an end of a pediment. The arrangement in the pediments of the Parthenon is not only true to art but true to optics.

fragment is a male torso. It was found to the east of the building and corresponds in style to the sculpture of the east pediment. If it belonged to the pediment it must have been near the centre as all the figures of the corners of the pediment are extant. As far as can be judged from the muscles the figure stood upright, the arms raised in astonishment and the head turned to the right. It therefore presented the left side to the spectator and occupied a place in the pediment to the observer's right. It was undoubtedly the figure of a god turning his head to behold the wonderful birth of Minerva, and expressing with his arms the astonishment with which the event filled him. The fragment remains in Athens.

On each side of the central group was a female figure in lively action. These were the last figures that were erect; beyond, figures were either seated or reclining.¹

The figure on the left is headless, and parts of the arms are wanting. There can be but little doubt, however, about the original action. The muscles show that the head was turned towards the centre of the pediment, and the remaining parts of the arms and what is left of the floating drapery show that the hands held the veil or outer garment wide open, perhaps in a line parallel to the descending line of the top of the pediment. The figure was therefore that of a young maiden of ripening form, frightened by the apparition and hurrying away from the scene. She may have been shielding herself with her veil, catching it as it was loosened by her rapid flight, or the gesture may be simply one of astonishment. She wears the dress worn by Spartan maidens. It was closed on one side only, so that in motion a limb was exposed. This dress, unknown to early art, was often given by later art to figures of Victory.

The name Iris has been given to this figure through a wrong conception of her action, it being supposed that she was hurrying to announce the birth of Minerva to

¹ All the figures of the Pediments are excellently engraved in the "Marbles of the British Museum," vol. vi.

the two seated female figures on her right. In that case her head would not have been turned back; besides, the two seated figures must be supposed themselves to be in Olympus and to be themselves spectators of the birth.¹

Next to Iris and nearer the corner of the pediment are two seated figures. The figure nearer to Iris is without head or hands. The left arm is raised and the muscles of the neck indicate that the head was turned to her companion, to call her attention to the unwonted event. The other figure is also headless. She rests her left arm on her companion's right shoulder, and her right hand on her own knee. Whoever they are, they must be goddesses and nearly related to one another.²

Next follows a single nude male figure reclining with its legs turned towards the extremity of the pediment. Hands, feet, and nose, are broken off. The names Theseus and Hercules have been alternately given to the figure. As it reclines upon a lion's skin, and as Hercules in an identical attitude is found on Greek coins, Hercules is more probably the correct name. On the coins the figure holds a cup in the right hand. Accepting such a restoration, Hercules may be regarded as reposing in Olympian beatitude.³

¹ Friederichs' notion that the garment was held in a straight line parallel to the descending line of the pediment cannot be accepted. The garment undoubtedly made a bow over the head, and this bow clearly indicated Iris. If the rapid motion of Iris be attributed to fright, the motive becomes commonplace.

² The names Ceres and Proserpina are those usually assigned to these figures. There is certainly something suggestive of the relationship of mother and child, not only in their attitude, but in the fact that the figure nearer Iris, which is presumed to be Ceres, is the larger. M. Beulé supposes that Ceres held in her left hand a sceptre, and in her right, either ears of corn or a thesmophoric roll. As these goddesses were intimately associated with the earth, Iris may be presumed to have met them on the confines of heaven. And so rapid has been her flight that on turning back her head she still sees the uncompleted action of the event she announces. Another idea advanced is that the figure of Iris was a later addition to the grouping of the pediment. Its execution is inferior, and its conception betrays a realistic period of art.

³ So much has been written about this figure that to quote were im-

In the corner of the pediment the sun-god emerges from the ocean. The neck and outstretched arms are all that remain; the hands and head have disappeared. Of the four horses he drove, the heads of the two outer ones are in the British Museum. Those of the two inner ones, in low relief, are still on the building. These heads were placed slightly in front of one another, so that they could all be seen from below.

To the right of the lost central group is a female torso clad in the simple and light drapery characteristic of Victory. Large holes in the back for the insertion of wings still further identify the figure. Fragments of these wings have been discovered. The right thigh of the figure was recognized in a fragment after the marbles had reached England. When this was adjusted a still livelier idea was conveyed of the swiftness with which Victory was moving towards the central group. The right arm was outstretched in the same direction, still further emphasizing the haste with which Victory was placing herself by the side of the new-born goddess whose inseparable companion she was ever after to be. The figure of Victory corresponds to the figure of Iris on the other side with the exception that while one moves towards, the other moves away from the central group. The severe archaic system of composition, illustrated in the *Ægina* groups, demanded that the action of all figures should be directed towards the centre. Here the system gives way to an ordering that is more free and better adapted to the large number of figures. If, as may be inferred, the central group contained at least twelve figures, adhesion to the old systems would have produced a dreary monotony. •

In addition to Victory, three figures have been pre-

possible. The student should read in its presence all the criticisms of the best writers. It should be studied from all points of view until it is known and felt to be the perfection of sculpture. In the course of a lecture delivered (1879) at the *École des Beaux Arts* in Paris, M. Duval, professor of anatomy, stated that in repeated and most careful examinations of the statue he had failed to discover the first departure from absolutely correct anatomy.

served from this side ; a single figure, and a group of two. The group is so arranged as to contrast with the arrangement of the corresponding group in the other angle.

The first figure is the headless torso of a seated female. The left arm, the right fore-arm, and the feet, are also wanting. The muscles of the neck show that the head was turned to the right, and a bunching of the drapery near the right shoulder shows that the garment must have been held by the right hand.

The group is of two headless female torsos ; the first one seated, the second in a recumbent attitude reclining in the lap of the first. Hands, feet, and part of the arms, are also wanting. The first one seems about to rise in astonishment ; the second one still reclines in undisturbed serenity. Though these two are apparently sisters, there are no indications which permit of their being named ; nor can a name be safely assigned to the single figure.¹

In the extreme corner were four horse heads to correspond to the four in the other corner. Of these four the two innermost in relief are still on the building ; one is lost, and the outermost one is in the British Museum. This head projected beyond the line of the building, so did the head of one of the horses of the sun-god, so did also parts of several of the figures. The severe law of relief was thereby again broken. Though the lines of the architecture must have been cut, the general effect may not have been marred.

The driver of these horses, which are plunging into the sea, was missing at Carrey's time. It has since been recognized in a figure recovered from the debris at the south-east corner of the building. This figure, which is much damaged, is in the New Museum at Athens. It is a female torso cut off a few inches below the waist so as to rest on the floor of the tympanum. The tunic is

¹ English writers have given these figures the names of the Fates, and the nomenclature may be accepted for lack of a better one. These statues show a treatment of drapery that is as faultless in its way as is the treatment of the nude in the Hercules.

held in front by two bands that cross and pass under the breasts. This arrangement of bands, which was undoubtedly imitated from life, was for the purpose of holding the garments in place while driving. The figure seems slightly bent. It evidently faced the angle, and was driving the horses that filled the extreme angle of the pediment. The holes in the girdle are where metal ornaments were fastened. Many of the other figures had metal bracelets and necklaces. Hercules wore metal sandals, as the holes in the feet indicate.

Occasional traces of color have been discovered. The backgrounds of the tympana were certainly colored, as were the ornaments, necklaces, bracelets, etc.; but how general was the use of color cannot be ascertained.

The backs of the figures, with the exception of that of the so-called Iris, are finished with nearly as much care as the fronts. It has been inferred from this fact that the statues were publicly exhibited before they were placed in position. A better inference is that this careful finishing is a characteristic of that early and conscientious art period when dilettanteism was unknown.

Rietschel's words deserve quoting. "It has always filled me with a kind of emotion and wonder, that the gable figures of the Parthenon were as highly finished behind as in front. The artist knew that when these statues had left his hand and workshop no human eye could look in and behold the charms his love and care had created and fostered.

Now, after more than two thousand years, a happy accident rather than an historic necessity reveals to us this love-offering of a true artistic soul. Why did the artist so work, and apparently so waste time and care? He did it in sympathy with the divine principles of creation that the thing made should be perfect and complete in self-independence. Just as the flowers which grow on a solitary precipice in a desert forsaken by man and beast are as perfectly made as the most beautiful product of horticulture; though they are not food for beasts, nor do they

rejoice the eye of man. No side object is in view, only harmoniously perfected development; that the Divine Creator may be praised."

The statues were undoubtedly executed at the time of the construction of the Parthenon, for they have many affinities with the old style which would not appear had their origin been later than that of the temple.

There is in existence a head that most likely belonged to a figure from one of the pediments in which archaisms are distinct. It is called the "Werber" head from the name of a Venetian merchant in whose possession it first appeared. It belonged originally to the secretary of Morosini, the Venetian general who commanded during the bombardment of Athens in 1687. The head was purchased by Count Laborde of Paris, and has since belonged to the Laborde collection. Holes in the forehead and in the ears point to the archaic custom of adding metal ornaments. Though the lips have been restored, the originality of the archaic smile is apparent. The smile is free from stiffness and only indicates gentle friendliness; it nevertheless prevents the expression from being entirely free, and is recognized as a lingering inheritance of a former art period. Archaisms may also be detected in the battered head of Hercules.

It may be stated, in a general way, that the workmanship of all the torsos is not of such a character that the imagination associates with them heads of intellectual or spiritual expression. In the case of the Munich Niobe torso, for instance, such an association is, on the contrary, irresistible. This criticism is not of the nature of fault-finding; its object is to define the character of the sculpture with precision. The sculpture must not be examined from the point of view of thought or emotion, but its wonderful technique is to be chiefly admired. In addition to beauty of pose and action, it may be fairly said that marble has been turned into flesh; the hardness and rigidity of the material has been completely mastered; the nude has the elasticity of life.

The figures are after nature ; not imitated from nature like the *Ægina* statues. Again, though in the rendering, the smallest details, even to the creases in the skin, are indicated, there is no trace of care or trouble in the execution. The statues seem self-created like Plato's dialogues. In the drapery there are no indications of the observance of stiff and pedantic rules. The garments lie lightly and attractively upon the bodies. Here also the marble is completely mastered. Folds are sharp in evident imitation of the old style, but such treatment is found in still later art periods and was retained for its evident advantages in the representation of dignity and majesty.

That Phidias himself executed any of these statues can only be conjectured. That they are not all by the same hand is evident. Compare, for instance, the drapery of the statue of *Iris* with that of the statue of the female who, outstretched, reclines on her sister's bosom. In the former details are few and treatment is broad ; the artist satisfying himself in the portraying of action ; over the latter he has poured a fulness of charming details, producing a wonderful combination of majesty and grace.

No other figure in sculpture can compare with this one in poetry of situation ; in beauty, dignity and freshness of form, or in freedom and exuberance of drapery.

THE WESTERN PEDIMENT.

Less has been preserved of this pediment than of the other ; but from Carrey's drawings the composition of the whole can be understood and a place assigned to each of the figures still in existence, as at the time of the artist's visit most of the statues were in place.

While in the eastern, or front, pediment *Minerva* was honored as one of the divinities of *Olympus*, here she appeared as the goddess of the land of *Attica*, represented, too, in the poetic and critical moment when she

confronts and drives back the sea-god who disputes the possession of her domain.

The entire figure of Neptune is given in Carrey's drawing. He is shown advancing with mighty tread, and has already passed over to the side of Minerva as if to take possession of her territory. But in the very act he is met by an opposing force that bends him back and makes retreat inevitable. This force is manifested in the figure of Minerva, who with her spear in her raised right hand opposes herself to the sea-god. No more admirable moment could have been chosen to exhibit both the power of the goddess and her regard for her adopted country.

Two fragments of the figure of Neptune are in existence; one in Athens, of the front part of the breast; and the other in the British Museum, of the upper part of the trunk. This later fragment, in which life and force find their highest expression, offers proof of the mistake committed by Winckelmann in assuming that the Greeks represented their divinities without veins in order to show more clearly their ethereal nature; for here the veins are properly and admirably rendered. Veins may be traced also on other figures of divinities both in the pediments and on the frieze. If Winckelmann's notion be at all correct, it must be applied to a much later art-period.

Of the statue of Minerva there is in the British Museum a fragment of the breast. The ægis may be recognized. Holes in it show that the Medusa's head and the fringe of serpents were of metal, and were fastened on. There is also in the British Museum a fragment of the upper part of the face. The hair is more wiry than that of the other statues and the eyes, as the hollows indicate, were inserted gems. The proportions of the fragment, however, and the fact that it was found within the pediment are strong evidences that it belonged to the statue. Holes in the hair indicate that the head bore a brazen helmet.

According to Carrey's drawing each principal figure had approached in a two-horse chariot and with a follow-

ing of lesser divinities. At Carrey's time the chariot of Neptune had already disappeared. Its driver is recognized in a fragment in the British Museum. Though greatly damaged, its great beauty is still evident.¹

Besides this fragment there are several others in the British Museum and in Athens that are supposed to have belonged to figures in Neptune's following, but they are too badly damaged to be recognized or to be interesting.²

On the side of Minerva, and again following Carrey's drawing, first came the horses of her chariot. Of these a few fragments are in Athens.³

Standing on the ground, back of the horses and near the charioteer, was a male figure of which the much damaged torso is in the British Museum. The right arm of this figure was stretched out over the horses, while its head

¹ From the parting of the garments leaving the left hip and leg bare Freiderichs supposes the figure to be Venus, though Venus could hardly have been represented as a charioteer and as serving Neptune in so subordinate a capacity.

² In Carrey's drawing, next to the chariot is placed a seated female figure with two children. These are probably Latona with the youthful Diana and Apollo. When Latona was pregnant she appealed to Neptune for a place of retreat. Neptune gave her the Island of Delos which, at times under water, had been floating about in the Ægean. With a stroke of his trident he fixed the island and made it dry and permanent. So Latona was ever his friend. Next to Latona and her children is another seated figure, with a young girl entirely nude on her lap. This is probably Thalassa with the youthful Venus. It may be the first instance in art where Venus was represented entirely nude. Even in Carrey's rough drawing this figure shows wonderful grace and most delicate beauty. The loss of no one classic work of art can be more deeply deplored. The period of immature and virginal maidenhood is rarely touched by Greek artists. It may have been that this figure was so perfect that none of Phidias' successors presumed to emulate the great master. Modern Italian sculptors in their statues of girls minister to a depraved taste. Phidias alone may have been able to represent the period with perfect artistic purity.

Carrey's drawing gives four other figures on the side of Neptune, and leaves a space for a fifth. Who they were cannot even be conjectured.

³ Morosini, the Venetian commander, attempted to remove them from the pediment, intending to take them home as a trophy; but his unskilful engineer let them fall, and they were dashed to pieces.

was turned to the charioteer as if giving directions in driving. Of the charioteer and of the three succeeding figures no recognizable fragment remains.

The last three figures, nearest the corner, are still in existence. Of these, two constitute a group and are the only figures that still occupy their original place on the building. Their action cannot be misunderstood. Both had their heads turned towards the central group and both were in lively agitation. The woman, of maidenly figure, clings to an elder and, according to Carrey, bearded man, as if frightened and seems to be endeavoring to rise. The muscles indicate that the left arm was raised in terror. The act loosens the clasp on the shoulder, so that the garments fall, exposing the left breast. The man is also in the act of rising, and for that purpose his left hand is hard pressed against the ground. Near the group is an object supposed to be the fold of a snake, and supposed to indicate that the group is Cecrops and one of his daughters.

The last figure, the one in the extreme corner, is of great beauty, vying with the Hercules of the other pediment. It is that of a youth reclining on his left hip, supporting himself by his left arm, and turning his body so as to better observe the centre of the group. The legs from the knees down, the right arm, and the left hand, are wanting. The head is also wanting. It is still more turned than the body, as is evident from the muscles of the neck.

This pediment differs from the other in that the action of the centre is communicated to the extreme ends. As sea and river divinities were generally represented reclining, they were often placed in the corners of pediments. This last figure has accordingly come to be called the Ilissus, or better the Cephissus, which, as the greater of the two rivers that water Attica, had better claim to be represented.¹

¹ If the Cephissus was represented by one statue in the pediments, the Ilissus was probably represented by another. German writers have endeavored to name all the figures of the pediments. As no

THE METOPES.

The metopes were originally ninety-two in number; thirty-two on each side, and fourteen on each end. Those of the east and west ends are still on the building, but so damaged as to be hardly recognizable. Of those of the north and south sides, many were destroyed by the explosion of 1687 which blew out the entire centre of the building; those of the north side, which are still in place, are extremely damaged. From the south side, fifteen were removed by Lord Elgin and are now in the British Museum. One had been previously removed by the French Count Choiseul Gouffier and is now in the Louvre. This metope has been restored; the restorer guiding himself by Carrey's drawings. Finally; Copenhagen has two fragments, the head of a Greek and the head of a Centaur. These fragments belong to one of the metopes in the British Museum, as is evident from Carrey's drawing of it. They were brought to Copenhagen by a Danish officer who was in the Venetian service during the bombardment.¹

two of these writers entirely agree, and no two are likely to agree, the whole subject may be dropped by those who only study the figures to know and to appreciate the highest artistic expressions of which the Greeks were capable.

¹ The explosion left thirteen on the north side and eighteen on the south side. One is still in place on the south side. It occupies the south-west corner and represents a Centaur with the head of his antagonist in "chancery." On the north side, thirteen are in place, four towards the east and nine towards the west. A few figures may be made out but nothing clearly understood. Four metopes, extremely mutilated, are in the New Museum at Athens. Of these, one is supposed to be from the north side and three from the south side. Other fragments will undoubtedly come to light. Marks of hammers show that the mutilations of the metopes were intentional. They were probably committed by Christian iconoclasts of the early centuries. For some unknown reason the metopes of the south side escaped mutilation, and at the time of Carrey's visit were reasonably well preserved. They represented scenes from the mythical history of the city and from Amazonian contests.

One of the metopes still on the building showed till lately traces of a red color on the background, and a piece of the drapery was green. It is inferred that all of the metopes were more or less colored. As on some of the heads the hair is not worked out, it is supposed that locks were partially indicated by color. That the weapons were of metal and fastened in is evident from the many holes in the marbles.

The thirty-two metopes of the south side were all drawn by Carrey. With the exception of nine in the centre they represent combats with Centaurs. The nine central ones give figures in repose, but the subjects cannot be made out from Carrey's drawings. The outer metopes, of which as already stated fifteen are in the British Museum, undoubtedly represent the contest that occurred between the Centaurs and the Lapithæ at the marriage of Pirithoüs. Some of the Centaurs are endeavoring to carry off women, while overturned and broken wine-jars indicate the marriage banquet. The subjects of these metopes do not appear to have any particular and special reference to the Parthenon, as similar scenes are found on other temples.

The temple of Apollo at Phigalia, the Theseus temple, and the temple of Jupiter at Olympia, were all similarly adorned. The idea may have been to represent in a general way the triumph of the culture and refinement of the Greeks over the rudeness and ignorance of barbaric neighbors; then again, there may have been the artistic notion of breaking up the severity of the straight lines of the architecture by the introduction of the energetic lines of combat.

As is generally the case where Greek art represents combats, the Greeks are younger than their antagonists. Here too the Centaurs with their rough looks and bristly beards make the youthfulness of the Greeks still more ideal. The groups present great variety, though within such limited space occasional similarity could not be avoided. It is evident that the metopes are the works of many hands. There are differences in the excellency of

both composition and execution. In most of the scenes drapery has been introduced to fill up vacant spaces, to bring out the nude, and to increase the liveliness of action. In two, which are comparatively poor, there is no drapery. Again, there are no fixed differences in the comparative size of the Greeks and Centaurs. In some scenes the Greek is insignificantly small; in others imposingly large. In a most effective metope, where a Centaur puts his right hand to a wound he has received in the back while with his left he endeavors to free himself from the Greek who seems on the point of dealing another blow, the relative size of the Greek seems too great.

Among the more excellent are those engraved in the seventh volume of the "Marbles of the British Museum," under the following numbers :

XII. Where the Centaur in triumph dashes over the prostrate body of his dying foe. VI. Where the Greek bears back his antagonistic with the left, and is ready to strike with the right. VII. Where the Centaur having seized the Greek by the leg throws him over a wine-jug; and III, where the Centaur holding the Greek down with his left fore leg hurls a wine-jug at his head. This last metope is the one from which the heads were broken off and are now in Copenhagen.

These metopes present the strongest contrast in technique to the archaic reliefs of Selinus. There, the figures are but slight elevations of the surface of the background with sharp and square edges; here form is freely rounded out, and is only in places attached to the background and then only for support. Parts, too, project beyond the line of the triglyphs; just as in the tympana some figures project beyond the pediments.¹

¹ It is supposed that the metopes that show archaisms were saved from the Hecatompedon, or old temple destroyed by Xerxes, and were replaced on the new temple as sacred mementos of the past. It may also be supposed that all the metopes were not executed at the time of Pericles, and that some of the poorer ones may owe their origin to a later and less artistic period. I know of no works of art that can be studied with more profit. The fact that the same subject is treated

THE FRIEZE OF THE CELLA.

Within the peristyle of the temple and along the top of the wall of the cella there was a continuous band of sculpture 524 feet long running all around the building.¹

This frieze was of necessity in very low relief. It was forty feet above the eye of the spectator standing within the colonnade, and the colonnade was but fifteen feet broad. The upper part of the sculpture would have been invisible had the sculpture been in high relief. Low relief was also necessitated by the part the sculpture had to play as the border of a wall. High relief would have produced an unpleasant impression from lack of apparent support, and would have seemed disconnected from the wall. Low relief did not interfere with the architectural lines, associated itself with the wall, and adapted itself to the idea of a continuous band of ornament.

About two-thirds of the frieze have been preserved; enough to permit an understanding of the whole. Car-

in so many ways and with so many degrees of excellence renders comparisons easy and profitable. The mind is naturally led to inquire into the sources of excellence on the one hand and into the causes of failure on the other. Let the student take any two in which the action is similar and recognizing the superiority of the one, compare it carefully and in minute details with the other until the causes of the superiority are thoroughly explored and understood. There are no works known to art that lend themselves so admirably to artistic training. For this purpose the poorer metopes are valuable as aids in understanding and appreciating those of superior merits.

The metopes are excellently engraved in the seventh volume of the *Marbles of the British Museum*, and many of the accompanying descriptions are full and satisfactory. Some enterprising American publisher should reprint the volume in cheap form with a few notes calling attention to the manner in which the metopes are to be used in artistic education, and giving a few analyses by way of example. Every art school in the country should be provided with copies of such a book.

¹ German foot = 12.356 English inches; 524 German feet = 539 feet; 6,544 English inches. Probably English feet are meant, as 524 feet is the length given by some English authorities, 525 by others.

rey's drawings give nearly the whole of it, including of course the parts destroyed by the explosion. The whole composition can, however, be made out from the parts in existence.

About one-half of the original frieze is in the British Museum. The Louvre has a single slab. A few fragments are scattered about in the various Museums of Europe, and some are in Athens. Late excavations have added several slabs to the Athenian collection.

The examination is best commenced from the rear, or west end of the building; for here the procession which is the subject of the frieze is supposed to start. The slabs of this side are all well preserved and are in nearly as good condition as when Carrey drew them. With the exception of the one at the north corner, which is in the British Museum, the slabs are still on the building.¹

On this side of the building are represented the preparations for the cavalcade, which on the two adjoining sides unfolds itself with richness and brilliancy. On the slabs towards the north some riders have already mounted and are galloping to join the march. Towards the south the preparations are the least advanced. Here (XXXV) one horseman is putting on his garment, another fastens his shoe, a third bridles his horse; a restive horse (XXXIV) declines to be bridled; another (XXXII) contentedly scratches his leg with his nose.²

¹ The sculpture was not on the wall itself but on slabs of marble inserted in the wall. A comparison of the slabs in Athens with those in London shows the destruction that is being wrought by England's humid atmosphere. The numbers given refer to plates in the eighth volume of the "Marbles of the British Museum." The volume describes fourteen slabs from the west side. They number from XXII to XXXV inclusive, No. XXXV being the slab on the south corner of the west side, for, as in the volume the description of the frieze begins with the other, or east side, the numbers come in inverse order. The numbers under and above XXII refer to the other side of the building.

² No. XXXIII is too interesting to be passed over. Stirrups are supposed to have been unknown to the ancients. A horseman is here represented inducing his nag to lower his back by advancing his fore legs. The motive, composition, and execution, are charming. The other nag on the slab is enjoying himself, but is evidently not a

The horsemen who follow (XXXI, XXX, XXIX) still ride in single file. They are not thronged as on the longer sides of the building; their advance, too, is interrupted by those who are still delaying, though the general direction of the march is from the south to the north.

As on the east side the division is in the centre, it might be expected it would be so here, and that each part of the procession represented on the longer sides of the building would start each way from the centre of this side. The artist intentionally avoided this mathematical division of his composition, and preferred to present this side as a connecting band between the two longer sides. Though one direction controls it, the direction is not so dominant as to exclude interrupting figures, whose presence prevents the composition from being tedious and monotonous. The garments of the youth are freely and artistically treated. Naked or lightly clad figures, too, vary with those in armor. Among the latter is one who is especially striking (XXVI). His armor is rich and extraordinary. His breastplate, ornamented with a Medusa's head, is attached to the back-piece by straps, ornamented with scales which were originally made more prominent by color.¹

At the north-west corner (XXII) is a standing figure. It undoubtedly held in its right hand a staff of some kind of metal. Similar figures occur at different points all along the procession. They are clothed in the himation, and are undoubtedly the marshals of the day. The youths who are taking active part in the cavalcade are, on the

bit vicious. This is one of the most attractive slabs of the frieze; and is a capital instance of the youthful, hearty, and jolly spirit which pervaded Greek life.

¹ So far as I could see, the scales are not on the connecting straps, but appear under the arms between the two pieces of armor — which are singularly separated — and indicate the existence of an under and species of chain armor. The different hats worn by the riders may indicate the different tribes who took part in the procession; or, perhaps, the distinguished strangers who, present in Athens at the time, were honored by being invited to take part in the festival.

contrary, clothed with the short chiton or with a small loosely flying cloak.

There are other and smaller figures that appear in different parts of the procession who are undoubtedly slaves or body servants. In their case isokephalism, or the law that all heads should reach up to the same line, is not observed. They were made small to indicate their condition. There are not enough of them, however, to produce any striking irregularity.

On the first slab of the north side (XXI) the scene is still of preparation. In the corner one of the serving figures, to which allusion has been made, is seen aiding his master in adjusting his garments. The quiet of preparation soon gives place to the animation of the procession (XX to XIII), and in the procession itself a gradual increase of animated action is observable. While at first the horses were standing or walking, now there are those that spring with all fours from the ground. The riders are all strong, and gracefully secure in their seats. Though the horses prance and spring they are not allowed to advance faster than do the footmen in other parts of the procession. All this part of the frieze is justly prized. The horses are filled with beautiful animation. Their thick necks and prominent eyes increase the expression of strength, courage, and life. Even the short-cut manes seem characteristic of the short, high, and restrained, action. In all the frieze, but especially in this part of it, there is abundant justification of the high praise given by ancient authors to Athenian sculptors and painters for their rendering of horses. This artistic excellence was encouraged by national taste. The Athenian youth delighted in horsemanship. Athenian poets, especially Sophokles, often draw their comparisons from the horse. The cognomen *ἵππος* is frequently connected with Attic names.

In archaic relief care was taken to prevent any superimposition of figures. Here the figures press over and on to one another, producing in the liveliest manner the impres-

sion of an advancing throng. The charm of the picture is still further increased by the great variety in the garments. Some of the figures are nude; some wear only a small loosely flying cloak; many wear the chiton, sometimes with sleeves sometimes without; others, both chiton and mantle; some wear boots, and a few, helmets. A few opposing or returning figures are skilfully introduced to prevent the onward movement from being monotonous.¹

In front of the cavalcade, whose thronging impetuosity gradually decreases, were grouped the chariots (XII, XI, X, IX). This part of the frieze is very fragmentary; still a fair idea of the whole may be obtained. Here, too, there is more action in the centre of the composition. There are slabs extant to show ten chariots. The chariots are driven by youths clothed in the garments peculiar to charioteers. In appears on ancient vases and is a long loosely hanging garment, sometimes with and sometimes without sleeves, and generally confined by bands which cross diagonally on the breast. Near the driver and generally with one foot on the chariot is a youth armed with helmet, lance, or spear; and near the horses is generally a herald, whose figure helps to fill out the empty space above the horses' backs. Some of the horses are so full of life that the drivers are bent back in the effort of restraining them. The heralds by sign and gesture seem to be assisting in maintaining order.

In front of the chariots come the pedestrians. Here the slabs are so few and their condition so damaged that but little can with certainty be made out. Immediately in front of the chariots Carrey puts a number of personages whose characters or offices do not appear from anything they wear or carry; next to them, four lute-players,

¹ Besides the slabs already referred to, there are several fragments in the British Museum, and at least eleven slabs in Athens, that apparently belonged to this part of the frieze. Those in London are for the most part continuous; those in Athens have not yet been sufficiently studied to give them their exact positions.

and then four flute-players. There are in Athens a few fragments of this portion of the frieze. Next, still following Carrey, came a youth lifting an object from the ground, and in front of him were three other youths bearing large water or wine jugs. The jugs have three handles and are similar to those seen on early black-figure vases. The slab bearing the three youths carrying jugs is in Athens; it also contains the object being raised from the ground by the fourth youth, and shows that it was also a jug. These youths were preceded by three others, bearing trays.

From here to the north-east corner were the oxen and other animals for the sacrifices. These are drawn by Carrey, and the accuracy of his work is substantially confirmed by many fragments still in Athens.

On the east side of the building, and advancing from the north-east corner, first came the maidens. Of these figures, two slabs are in existence; one in London, (VIII) and one in the Louvre. (*Notice de la Sculpture Antique* par M. Fröhner, vol. i, No. 125, Paris, 1869.) According to Carrey there were two figures between the end of the London slab and the north-east corner. The Paris slab was immediately in front of the London one. The maidens of the east side make a very different impression from the youth of the north side. In the latter freedom and variety are conspicuous; here, uniformity; there, free and uncontrolled naturalness; here, retiring modesty and well-ordered propriety. This uniformity does not, however, exclude variety in the drapery. The undergarment of some is Doric and sleeveless; of others, it is Ionic with its open sleeves gracefully laced. The maidens carry a variety of sacrificial utensils; some, single-handled vases which were filled from the larger jugs, and which in turn were used to fill the smaller dishes and goblets; others, round dishes with a ring in the centre through which a finger was passed. One, at the end of the London slab, holds an article that has been taken for a large candelabrum; it is more probably a censer (Thymiater-

rion), of which the receptacle on top had a perforated cover. The last figure on the French slab assists in carrying this object. The French slab is the only one which has suffered from modern restoration. Of the eight heads it contains only two are antique, those of the third and of the seventh figures. The two male figures on this slab have the garments worn by the heralds or marshals of the procession. They seem engaged in giving the maidens directions.

Next is a slab (VI) on which a number of men, young and of full age, are gathered in attitudes of easy repose.¹

The frieze on the south side as on the north commenced with a cavalcade, and it is to be presumed that the cavalcade presented the same variety in its composition. Unfortunately the slabs of both the beginning and the ending of the cavalcade have disappeared, nor can those preserved be arranged in sequence. The cavalcade is inferior to that of the north side in both composition and execution. On some slabs the work is decidedly bad, and nowhere is seen that massing of figures which imparts so much life to the other cavalcade. The horsemen follow at even distances. There is less variety in the action, and an absence of spirit and dash. In front of the horseman were chariots as on the other side. Their number is unknown. Fragments of five (XLV, VI and VII) are in London. Of two of these (XLVII) the horses are standing still. These two may therefore have been immediately in front of the cavalcade. In front of the chariots was a group of men corresponding with the group on the north side. There is a fragment of this group (XLIV), but it throws no light on the character or occupation of the individuals composing it. Between

¹Probably marshals who at the halting of the procession have assembled in a body at its head. Then follow the slabs directly over the eastern or main entrance to the temple. Their examination may be properly preceded by an examination of the south side, and of those parts of the east side that form a continuance of the south side (XXXVI to LV inclusive, and at least four more in Athens).

this group and the sacrificial animals nothing has been preserved.¹

The animals and their conductors constitute one of the finest parts of the whole frieze. Some of the animals go quietly by the side of their drivers, others are fractious. A scene where an ox seeks to make his escape and is with difficulty held by two youths is one of the liveliest representations of ancient art (XLII).²

One of the youths must be supposed to be holding the animal by a halter while the other one seizes him directly by the horns. To appreciate the character of this sculpture it should be compared with similar scenes of Roman work; with the procession on the arch of Titus, for instance. There seriousness and a ceremonial severity are preserved throughout. A heavy solemnity regulates the action of the animals as well as that of the individuals. Here, although it is evident that the procession is a religious one, the free expressions of nature are not suppressed, but are most happily introduced to relieve monotony and to destroy dullness.

The halters that held the animals were only indicated in color, and were not of metal. This is inferred from the absence of holes in this part of the frieze. For the same reason some of the crowns with which individuals are being decked could only have been indicated in color.

The animals and their attendants reached to the end of the building. The very corner slab has been preserved

¹ Carrey's drawings of this part of the frieze are so carelessly done that but little can be learned from them. That the two sides harmonized is not to be doubted; that they were identical, as Friederichs seems to suppose, is unnecessary. On the contrary, such an arrangement would not accord with accepted notions of Greek art. If there were musicians, etc., on this side, there may not have been so many of them. Certainly a greater space on this side was occupied by the sacrificial animals and their attendants, than on the other. Carrey may have taken for granted that the two sides were alike, and may have supplied some of the drawings of this side by repeating those of the other. His drawings are sufficiently careless to justify the supposition.

² A similar scene is on one of those slabs from the north side which are in Athens.

(XXXIX). On its end, forming the first figure of the east side, is a marshal who by an admirable trait turns as if giving directions to the procession around the corner. Then follow maidens as on the other half of the east side (XXXVII, XXXVIII). They carry such pitchers as the others carry. Some have long trumpet-like articles. These are probably torches, as torches had a place in worship and sacrifice.¹

Then, passing three groups of men corresponding to those on the other side, the central group is again reached.²

The frieze immediately over the eastern entrance to the cella contained a group of five standing figures with three groups of seated figures on each side of it (I, II, III, IV, V). The seated figures are divinities. This is not inferred from their size which may have been necessitated by the law of isokephalism, but from certain unmistakable peculiarities. For instance; in the group on the extreme right there was a figure clearly characterized as Cupid. All that remains of this group is a seated female figure with a singular cap on her head, close to whose left arm is the fragment of the right arm of another female figure who sat in front of her.³

Of the rest of the group the original marble has disappeared. There exist, however, two plaster casts of parts of the lost portions of the slab. These casts do not entirely agree. One represents a boy with a staff in his left hand, part of the knees and legs of a woman against whom he is leaning, and the woman's left arm resting on his left shoulder, her hand outstretched as if calling his

¹ These slabs are much damaged. The articles Friederichs takes for torches may be but folds in the drapery. According to Carrey, next to the marshal at the corner were five female figures carrying dishes.

² Nothing in ancient art is more admirable than these groups (XXXVI, XXXVII). To grace and ease of repose is most skilfully added a slight notion of the fatigue resulting from the discharge of the duties of a marshal.

³ The slab is in Athens and contains also two seated male figures.

attention to the approaching procession. According to Carrey's drawing the female figure is the same whose right arm appears on the Athenian slab. The other cast represents the same boy, winged and holding an umbrella over his head; it also gives the seat upon which the woman is resting, the upper part of her left arm with its drapery, one foot of the other seated female, and a standing male figure in front of the boy. One of the slabs in the British Museum contains the original of this male standing figure (VI). Back of it, on the edge of the slab, can be made out the hand of the woman and the staff of the boy. Above the staff is something that may be the remnant of the umbrella. From this it appears that when the plaster cast first mentioned was taken, the wings and the umbrella must have been artificially removed from the mould, as well as such other parts as the operator thought did not contribute to the artistic effect.

The wings indicate that the boy is a divinity, and those associated with him must be divinities also. He is Cupid and the article he holds must be an umbrella or a sun-shade. As he was the only divinity who went about entirely naked, the sun-shade, generally assigned to women, afforded him convenient protection. Or it may be that he is here represented as the servant of Venus protecting her from the sun; for the figure nearest to him must be Venus, and Venus is often represented with a sun-shade, which either she bears herself or which is borne for her.¹

If the seated figures are to be regarded as divinities, the next question is how far can their individualities be established. The group, to the (spectator's) left of the five

¹ The idea of Cupid going about with an umbrella over his head is somewhat absurd. Neither umbrella nor wings appear in Carrey's drawings, and his drawings of this part of the frieze are particularly careful. The question is an unprofitable one to the art-lover, but one in which German critics delight. There is no reasonable doubt that the seated figures are Athenian divinities, but with two or three exceptions their individuality has not been established. The three of this group are by some critics named Ceres, Proserpina and the boy Iachus, by others the daughters of Cecrops, and the boy Erechthonius.

standing central figures, consists of Jupiter, Juno and Hebe, or Victory. This is inferred in the first place from the conspicuous position occupied by the group; then, Jupiter's seat differs from all the others. It has arms supported by sphinxes, it is larger and more elaborate. Jupiter himself has a sceptre in his right hand.

Attention has been called to the difference between this Jupiter and the bust of Otricoli. The original of the Otricoli Jupiter has been commonly assigned to Phidias; but this Jupiter and the Otricoli type differ too widely to have had the same origin. This head, with its close-cut and pointed beard, is not free from archaisms. In it is preserved much of the religious dignity and severe nobility of the old style. The Otricoli bust, on the other hand, is entirely free from archaic restraints and has an expression that shows an advanced art-period.¹

The figure next to Jupiter is undoubtedly Juno who, with a gesture of lively interest, removes her veil from her face that she may the better see the advancing procession. The female figure standing by Juno's side was probably winged; at least no better explanation can be given for the projection that appears in the marble over her left shoulder. In her left hand was probably a crown. Her position and size indicate that she was some lesser divinity; either Hebe or Victory. In the group of four to the left of Hebe (I) only one figure can be recognized with any reasonable degree of certainty, that is the female figure which bears in her left hand a long torch. A torch was the attribute of Ceres; the broad and full forms also correspond to Ceres' maternal character. The end figure turned towards the procession may be Mercury, as the hat on his knees is probably the *πέτασος*, or broad brimmed hat peculiar to that deity.²

¹ Overbeck regards this Jupiter as one of the very finest productions of ancient art. He also advances reasons for supposing it to have been the type used by Phidias in his gold and ivory statue at Olympia. *G. der G. K.*, I, 303.

² The first figure from the first group has been called Mars, from its

The first group to the right of the central standing figures (IV) may be recognized on the supposition that Minerva herself could not have been absent from such a gathering. If the explanations so far given be correct then the choice for Minerva lies between this figure, which is one of the most charming of the entire frieze, and the figure in a cap grouped with Venus to which attention has already been called. The figure in a cap, to which the name Peitho has been given, does not suggest Minerva. It moreover occupies a subordinate position. Here the position is conspicuous. Another point is that three holes may be noticed in the side of the figure; one in the arm, one in the drapery, and the third in the seat. These holes are in line and may very possibly indicate where Minerva's lance was fastened. Still, the very youthful, gracious, and gentle, character of the figure, and the absence of the ægis, do not seem becoming to Minerva when surrounded by her worshipping people.¹

If the figure be accepted as Minerva, then the figure next to her must be Vulcan; for Attic tradition associated the two most intimately. Vulcan is no more idealized than the marshals; for Vulcan was conceived as an artisan. The staff, too, indicates the god whose lameness prevented him from standing firmly on his feet.

The following group (on the Athenian slab) may be Neptune and Apollo. Neptune was too important a divinity to be absent, and the first figure of this group suggests Neptune better than any other. The second and more youthful figure had on its head a wreath as is evident from the many holes on the hair, and a wreath was an attribute of Apollo. In the figure of Neptune is evidenced that the conception of this divinity as a coarse

resemblance to the Mars of the Ludovisi Villa. The third figure may be Bacchus. A metal thyrsus may have been in his hand.

¹ The conception of Minerva, in holiday time, laying aside her helmet and the terror-bearing ægis and appearing among her people as a most charming young girl, is not at all inconsistent with the cheerful and friendly ideas the Greeks had of their divinities.

and violent personage is the product of a post-Phidian period. A display of violence would not have been consistent with the rest of the composition. It moreover appears — and pictures on vases support the idea — that at this period all divinities wore a calm and noble expression unaffected by circumstance or situation. These two figures are excellently preserved. The left hand of Apollo, and the ends of his feet, are wanting, and the right hand of Neptune has suffered from intentional mutilation.

The groups of divinities are arranged with studied symmetry; yet there is no stiffness. There are three groups on each side: two of three figures, and four of two. On one side, the group of three is the outermost; on the other side, the innermost. Of the four groups of two, two are composed of male figures; two, of a male and a female. The corresponding groups are not arranged according to the strict principle followed in the pediments of Ægina, but in accordance with that freer principle seen in the grouping of the east pediment of the Parthenon. The rule that corresponding parts should be at equal distances from the centre is no longer obeyed.

The divinities are undoubtedly to be conceived as assembled to receive the offerings brought by the procession, yet the dignity and state of the divine nature have been so completely concealed that the gods appear as unconstrained and but mildly interested spectators.

In the very centre is the group of standing figures. It consists of two groups of two each, and of a single figure standing by itself. The reason for this unsymmetrical division does not appear, nor is the meaning of the whole scene understood. On the right an elderly man receives from a boy a large cloth folded closely together. Next to them a woman receives from a maiden an article that looks like an upholstered stool. The maiden carries the stool on her head. The fifth figure is also a maiden. She also carries a stool on her head, and in addition has

in the left hand an article that cannot be recognized. Of the stool carried by the first maiden one leg is in marble. The other was in metal, as is indicated by a hole in the slab, back of the maiden's shoulder, where it was undoubtedly fastened. Owing to this difference of material, the stool must have been colored to produce uniformity.

Many difficulties are encountered in the effort to interpret this central scene.

The group on the right is commonly accepted as representing the reception of the peplos, which was brought and presented to Minerva by the procession of the great Panathenaic festival. But the peplos, which is supposed to have been a rich garment decorated with scenic embroidery, was not intended for the Minerva who dwelt in the Parthenon, but for Minerva Polias who was worshipped in the Erechtheum; for there stood her wooden image which was the object to be clothed. There seems no propriety in representing this scene on the Parthenon.

Another difficulty is presented by the appearance of the article itself. It in no way resembles a garment, but is rather a large rectangular cloth closely folded. Still another difficulty arises from the apparent disconnection of this central scene from the procession; for there is nothing to show that the garment and the stools were brought by the procession. Again what possible explanation can be given for the appearance of stools in such a scene? The whole scene, nevertheless, must have been of the greatest importance and of the deepest religious significance; for it was directly over the door of entrance and occupied the very central and most conspicuous position of the entire composition.

It is not this central group alone that is hard to understand; the difficulty extends to the entire procession. Classic authors state that a ship was placed on wheels and that the peplos was fastened to it as a sail, so that spectators might admire its beauty and study the scenes embroidered upon it as the procession moved along. Of

this ship there is no indication upon any part of the frieze.¹ . . .

Attention has already been called to the artistic character of the work. In a frieze of over 500 feet in length, artistic inequalities would necessarily occur even if it were all executed by one hand. Details are more carefully worked out in some parts than in others. The manes of the horses, for instance, are sometimes free and floating as in nature; at other times, stiff and artificial. In general, however, both composition and execution are of the highest merit. That the frieze was as full of suggestions to the artists of antiquity as it is to artists nowadays may not be doubted; but that such works as the Mars of the Villa Ludovisi, the Jason of the Louvre, and the Dioscuri of the Quirinal, are directly copied from the frieze is an extreme assertion.

In 437 B.C. the statue of Minerva was erected within the Parthenon and the building was dedicated to her worship. This date may be approximately assigned to the frieze, though it is not known whether the work was finished before or after the dedication of the temple.

THE ELEUSINIAN DIVINITIES.

46. A marble relief found in 1859 at Eleusis; now in the New Museum of Athens.

¹ It is useless following Friederichs' objections any further. The artist's intention was not to copy accurately, but to represent artistically. The frieze is not a historic document, but a work of art.

Merseus, a learned Dutchman, who lived in the first part of the seventeenth century, made a compilation of extracts from Greek and Latin authors on the subject of the Panathenaic festivals. These extracts are unsatisfactory and very contradictory. If the peplos was large enough to be hung up as a sail, it may have been the curtain that hung like a garment around the chryselephantine statue of the Minerva of the Parthenon to protect it from dust and damp and to reserve its showing for extraordinary occasions. The separation of the central scene from the procession conveys the idea that the scene takes place within the temple. That the ship is not represented is sufficient evidence that its representation would not have been artistic. The artist, too, may not have limited his fancy to the recollection of any one festival, or procession, but may have idealized the many joyous gatherings of which the Parthenon was the centre.

There can be little doubt that the two female figures are Ceres and Proserpina; but which is Ceres and which Proserpina is a question. The figure to the left may have the more youthful appearance and the more constrained attitude. The details of hair and drapery are more simple and indicate the maiden, while the rich and elaborate drapery of the other figure distinguishes the matron. Throughout the whole history of Greek art the principle governs of representing maidens in plainer attire than matrons and of giving them more quiet attitudes and more subdued gestures.

- Who the boy is, and what is the action of the group, are still more difficult questions.

The woman with the sceptre, supposedly Proserpina, appears to be handing something to the boy. Whatever the article was, it must have been very small as she holds it between her thumb and the ends of her fingers. The other woman, supposedly Ceres, places a crown upon the boy's head. A hole near the boy's forehead shows where the crown was held and indicates that it was of metal.

The boy has been named Triptolemus, Iacchos and Plutos; but to each name there are serious objections.

The traces of color are still visible. And if small holes are to be taken as indications, Ceres wore necklace, bracelets, and ear-rings; ornaments which distinguished her still more from her daughter.

This relief is a work of most eminent religious character. In comparison with the solemn, one might almost say holy, impression produced by these divinities the gods and goddesses of the Parthenon appear secular and merry. The composition and execution testify to a pure, lofty, and unquestioning faith. In spite of the different apprehension of divinity here displayed, this relief is to be assigned to the same period as the marbles of the Parthenon. The technique of the figure of Proserpina is identical with that of the maidens on the Parthenon frieze. The differences in the presentation of divinity may have been intentional and intended to accord with the differing

circumstances. When the gods were assembled for the purpose of taking part in the festivities of their people their appearance was naturally freer and more informal than when special religious purposes were to be served. The relief must have been an object of importance in worship, and was probably surrounded by architecture of an appropriately severe character.¹

ORPHEUS, EURYDICE, AND MERCURY.

47. A marble relief in the Villa Albani. Both feet of Orpheus, the right foot of Eurydice, and parts of the right leg and right arm of Mercury, are restorations. There is a repetition of the work in the Naples Museum and another in the Louvre in Paris. In the Naples example the names of the characters are inscribed above them; in the Paris example appear the names Amphion, Antiope, and Zetheus. The inscriptions on the Paris slab are comparatively modern, while those on the Naples slab are ancient though they may not be as ancient as the slab itself. The frieze itself, however, so admirably illustrates the story of Orpheus that there can be no doubt of the correctness of the Naples names. When Orpheus had recovered his bride from the lower world and was leading her back to earth he violated the condition of not looking at her till entirely past the portal of Hades, and as he

¹ The slab was found within the ruins of the temple of Ceres where from the dawn of history till A.D. 396 were celebrated the Eleusinian mysteries, the most solemn ceremonies of Grecian worship. Ceres is sufficiently indicated by the torch which served her when looking the world over for her daughter. If the slab may be taken as illustrating the spirit of the Eleusinian mysteries, it is a strong argument for their purity and for the solemn elevation of their character. They were undoubtedly derived from Egypt, and were part of the religion in which Moses was disciplined. The slab has been broken and has been evidently exposed to fire. The traces of color to which Friederichs alludes are more probably fire-stains. I do not agree with those who suppose the slab, below the fracture, to be a restoration. The difficulty of naming the divinities has partially arisen from the secondary and subordinate position occupied by the supposed figure of Ceres.

looked she disappeared from his sight forever. The artist of the relief has made use of the myth to represent a scene of most delicate pathos. Eurydice turns herself longingly to Orpheus and puts her hand on his shoulder with a gesture that speaks of the utter impossibility of leaving him. Orpheus' own bitterness is expressed by his hand moving towards the hand of his beloved. But their parting must be speedy; for already has Mercury, the soul conductor, taken Eurydice by the other hand to lead her back to Hades. Even the god cannot escape the sad influence of the scene; his face wears an expression of pity, and his right hand is clasped as if in the repression of grief. His heart opposes itself to the duty he must perform.

The helmet worn by Orpheus is frequently seen on Amazons. Here it is intended to show that Orpheus is a stranger. The boots, also, characterize the wandering minstrel. Their turned-over tops are only indicated by a groove. These tops were originally further marked by color. Mercury wears the short cloak and the undergarment of early art. The large hat thrown back of his head, and the thick short curls, still further identify the god. His entire appearance is remarkably in accordance with that of the youthful cavaliers of the frieze of the Parthenon. There is the same head; the same too highly placed ears, and the same method of gathering up the garments.

The three figures of the frieze bear in ordering of drapery and in delicacy of action the stamp of Attic art, and of Attic art during the highest period of its development. The relief cannot have been executed long after the frieze of the Parthenon. It must belong to the end of the fifth century. That no one of the three examples is an original is evident from the many technical faults. In the Albani one, for instance, the left leg of Mercury is out of drawing, the right thumb of Eurydice is too short, etc., etc.

These copies may have been made during the Roman period to decorate the graves of beloved consorts; for on

Roman sarcophagi various scenes from the myth appear, all intended to show forth the close union between the living and the dead.

This relief is a beautiful illustration of one of the leading principles of Greek art; that is, extreme moderation in the expression of passion. The greatest grief is here most delicately, and yet most intensely, expressed by a few voiceless gestures; merely by the turning of a hand.

Poetry has greater liberty than sculpture in depicting the soul's emotions. It is the part of sculpture to modify the naturally vehement expressions of emotion, and to keep them within noble restraints. No force will be lost; grace will even give additional power. This subduing and moderating of outward expression belongs only to the highest period of art. Later, nature enforced her own licentiousness.¹

*RELIEFS FROM THE TEMPLE OF APOLLO EPICURIUS
IN PHIGALIA.*

48. These reliefs were discovered by the same company of Germans and Englishmen who were so successful at Ægina. The reliefs are in the British Museum. The frieze was within the cella over a row of semi-detached columns which surrounded the Hypaithron, and facing the interior. With the exception of a few fragments, the whole frieze was recovered. The frieze represents two distinct series of contests; the one of Greeks with Amazons, and the other of the Centaurs and the Lapithæ. On a slab that probably divided the series are Apollo and Diana in a chariot drawn by stags. The series relating to the Amazons is the longer, so that the frieze in its divisions did not cor-

¹ As research extends acquaintance with Greek sculpture it is becoming evident that this moderation of which Friederichs and other writers speak was the gift of but few artists and was not the characteristic of a period or the heritage of a country. The discovery of the statues of the pediments of the temple of Jupiter Olympus at Elis has rudely shaken the belief of those taught to expect grace, beauty, and moderation, in every piece of Greek marble.

respond to the architectural divisions of the Hypaithron. There are twenty-three slabs, of which but ten belong to the Centaur series. Nor can any sequence be established among the slabs; for, contrary to the usual custom, each slab contains whole figures and shows completed and independent action.¹

The composition of the frieze is of the highest liveliness. In no other work of Greek art is there displayed such a daring and excited phantasy. The artist, too, seems intentionally to have selected cruel and brutal scenes. He has even put children in the arms of the women whom the Centaurs attempt to outrage.

On the side of the Centaurs the contest is conducted with an intense and unmitigated brutality; on the side of the Amazon, scenes are introduced where pity is displayed, but apparently only to bring out in bolder relief scenes that are devoid of it.

In one scene (Marbles of the British Museum, vol. iv, Pl. II), a Centaur shows his brutish nature by very in-artistic biting and kicking. The scene in which Cæneus is crushed (Pl. IV) is a composition of great energy and force. On one slab a Greek actually takes a Centaur by the leg (Pl. V). On another, a Centaur braces himself with a fore-foot against a statue of a goddess, from which he would force a woman who clings to it for protection. He succeeds in tearing off her clothing before her avenger comes to the rescue. In the Amazon series there are figures and attitudes of singular beauty and attractive episodes, though here, too, there is unnecessary exaggeration. There are touching appeals for mercy, and kindly assistance is offered the wounded. On one slab (Pl. XVIII), Theseus is supposed to be recognized from the

¹ The slab containing the divinities is placed by late investigators to the right of the entrance and one slab from the further right-hand corner. In front of the divinities along the right side, and over the entrance, was the Centaur series; the Amazon series occupying the left side, the further side, and one slab on the right side behind the divinities. So far investigators agree. They also claim to be able to recognize which were the corner slabs.

lion's skin he bears. On the same slab a Greek seems raising from a falling horse a dead or dying Amazon who is twisted into a remarkable position and wears trousers.

The presence of Theseus in the Amazon series would indicate that the frieze was executed to his honor, but why he should be so honored in a city of Arcadia does not appear. No special significance can be attached to the Centaur contests, because such contests so often appear on Greek temples.

Apollo and Diana were introduced, because the temple was dedicated to Apollo who was here worshipped under the name *Epicurius*, or the preserver, as he enjoyed the reputation of having saved the inhabitants of Phigalia from the plague which ravaged Greece at about the time of the beginning of the Peloponnesian war.

As Pausanias states that the temple was built by Ictinus, the architect of the Parthenon, the two buildings must be of about the same age. The relief, however, must be later than the Parthenon, and is probably of the fourth century. The sculpture is as free in its composition as that of the *Niké* temple; as pairs of fighters alternate with scenes containing many figures, and many other departures from the strict rules of early relief appear.

Attempts at fore-shortening are ugly and unsuccessful.

In further reference to time the relief must be early in comparison with the reliefs on the Mausoleum; for here faces are entirely without pathetic expression, and form, instead of being slight and delicate as it was in later art, is thick, short and heavy. An oddity is that the Amazons are throughout clothed in garments which are essentially Greek. The frieze contains so many errors of detail that it is evident its execution was entrusted to inferior hands.¹

¹ The frieze as a work of art is not worthy of the attention it has received. Its especial interest is the contrast it presents to the frieze of the Parthenon. It has none of the grace or "moderation" of the later, but displays great strength and boldness in conception and execution. Its conspicuous position within the temple demanded that high artistic skill should be employed on it; that is, if such skill were

SCULPTURE OF THE ERECHTHEUM.

49. The portico of the Caryatides on the south side of the Erechtheum has withstood the storm of time with fair success. Five maidens of the original six were still standing in their places when, at the end of the last century, the English architects Stuart and Revet surveyed the ruins of Athens. The sixth had disappeared; probably struck by a bomb during the Venetian siege. Of this, the sixth figure, so many fragments were found about 1837 and subsequently, that in 1847 they were put together, wanting parts were supplied, and the restored figure was put back in its place. In the beginning of the present century the building experienced a great loss; for Lord Elgin, not satisfied with his Parthenon booty, removed the fairest of the sisters and transported her to London, where she now stands alone in the British Museum.¹

In 1846 a plaster cast of this figure was placed in position. Still earlier a figure that had fallen down after Stuart's visit was reërected. Lately, portions of pediment and plinth have been restored, so that now a fair idea can be had of the original appearance of this beautiful building.

The hands and portions of the arms of all the figures are broken off; feet have suffered, and faces are disfigured. The draperies were probably colored; at least traces of blue are said to have been recognized on the London statue.

If the Greeks did not invent the idea of substituting human figures for columns, they certainly beautified and ennobled it.

to be had and would have been appreciated had it presented itself. The artist who discharged the task had a fervid imagination, but little sense of beauty. He may have been the Giulio Romano of the Phidian age.

¹ A wanton and inexcusable theft. If his lordship had stolen all the figures his act would not appear so flagrant. He might as well have cut out any one of the Apostles from Leonardo's *Cena*.

Before the Persian war the human figure appears as supports to thrones and tripods and as handles to mirrors and various utensils ; but it is not found in Greek architecture. When the human figure was first used as an architectural member captives taken in war and bearing burdens as slaves were probably represented. Even the term "Caryatid" is thought to be derived from "Karyæ," a Greek city which for services to the Persians was destroyed by the other Greeks ; all its inhabitants being either killed, or sold into slavery.¹

The Caryatides of the Erechtheum are maidens bearing baskets on their heads. They are "Kanephoroi" : a name given to those Athenian maidens who in religious processions bore in baskets on their heads the utensils used in sacrifices. Or it may be that the "Arrhephoroi" are here represented ; that is, those maidens who were especially appointed to sacred services in the Erechtheum, and who, upon a fixed day each year, carried in baskets on their heads through the city certain highly revered relics. The "Arrhephoren" must, however, have been younger than these figures. The underlying idea of the whole composition may have been that to their services as basket-carriers they voluntarily added that of bearing up the temple's slight portico.

The maidens have but a light burden to carry ; an Ionic entablature from which, to make it still lighter, even the frieze has been removed. Beneath a heavier burden the human figure would seem out of place.

In Greek architecture the chief burden-bearer is the column, and the columnar principle is seen to control to a

¹ The treason and subsequent destruction of Karyæ lack historic proof. A better explanation of the term "Caryatid," is that the name was given to those of the women of Karyæ who did honorable service in the temple of Diana, to whose worship the inhabitants of the place were devoted ; for there is no appearance of servitude in the pose or gesture of these noble images. The term must not then be accepted as one of reproach, but as honorable, and should not be given to those captive figures which in early Persian, in Roman, and in late French architecture, perform the duty of pier or column.

certain extent the appearance of these figures. Individuality was of course impossible; only slight changes in the arranging of hair, drapery, etc., could be allowed. One noticeable effect of the principle is seen in the different poses taken by the maidens. The maidens on the sides rest on the outer leg; and of the two in front, each rests like the corner maiden next to her. As the leg used for resting is straighter than the other, that leg should be out so as to accord with the lines of the building, and symmetry required that of the two maidens in front, each should be like those next to her. That the maidens are not obliged to stand firmly upon the two feet still further carries out the idea that their task is an easy one. The attitude chosen is moreover graceful in itself, and in keeping with the Ionic order.

There are caryatides with severely symmetrical figures and with one or both arms raised to help in supporting the burden. Here the elevation of arms would not have been in keeping, and would have made too great a contrast with the porticos on the north and east of the building, each of which is supported by Ionic columns.

There are indications that these maidens held the edge of their garments with one hand while the other hung by the side. The drapery is so arranged that perpendicular lines prevail, but even these are gracefully interrupted and varied.

The caryatides of the Erechtheum perform all their architectural duties and still preserve a noble and beautiful personality. To appreciate them fully they must be compared with caryatides of the Roman period. They also make a most extreme contrast to those colossal figures of giants who in painful toil held up the roof of the temple of Jupiter at Agrigentum in Sicily.

The occupation of these maidens required that their figures should be strong and full. It will be noticed that on each side of their necks are two locks of hair. These locks are not so much for increasing supporting power as for securing that harmony of straight lines which might be

hurt by the sudden bend from head to neck. On each head is such a cushion as was always used when objects were carried, and above each cushion is a basket-shaped object decorated with the egg and pearl shaped mouldings of the Ionic order. Roman caryatides have on their heads an exact representation of a basket. An exact basket might not be offensive to the Corinthian order and might pass as a Corinthian capital; but it certainly would be very materialistic. Here an artistic compromise is effected between the object carried and the character of the dominant order. A basket literally rendered would have been inartistic; and an Ionic capital would not have suggested the duties performed by the maidens. The artist has effected a combination which is satisfactory and beautiful.

In artistic worth the figure in the British Museum is pre-eminent. Its drapery is more carefully and fully executed and more beautifully arranged. In some of the figures folds in the drapery are hardly more than indicated. The figures, though probably all designed by the same artist, were undoubtedly executed by different hands.¹

¹ Though the single figures are very beautiful they need to be seen in position to be properly appreciated, for one of their chief attractions results from the place they occupy in the perfect harmony established in this portico between architecture and sculpture. The portico is so small that it would not require a hall of very large dimensions to contain a representation of the whole of it. There is no more pathetic and appealing figure in art than the lonely sister of the British Museum. Now that civilization is securely established in Attica, and Athens has become easily accessible, further delay in restoring her to her family is cruel.

During the excavations of 1836 fragments of marble figures flattened on one side were found in the debris about the Erechtheum. As a number of iron clamps still exist on the building, it was concluded that these fragments were parts of figures which had been fastened to the building as a species of frieze. The fragments are small and totally unrecognizable. They are interesting as showing a novel arrangement, for the frieze was not wrought on slabs, but each figure was made by itself and fastened on the projecting entablature. This necessitated the figures being made flat on one side so as to fit the projecting flat surface. Another fact of interest is that with the fragments of figures were found fragments of inscriptions which undoubtedly referred to the figures. The inscriptions give names of workmen employed and the prices paid them. For instance: "Iasos, the Kolyttian; for the

Sculpture of the Niké Temple.

THE FRIEZE.

50. The small temple of Niké Apteros, or wingless Victory, which stood near the Propylæa on the Acropolis did not in some respects experience so hard a fate as the Parthenon. It stood comparatively uninjured till the time of the Venetian bombardment. It was then taken down and its materials used by the Turks in the construction of a battery.

In 1835 the architects Schaubert and Hansen, under the direction of Prof. Ross, got together the materials and reconstructed the temple; the roof and the pediments only being wanting. The frieze of the north and west sides had been previously found and removed by Lord Elgin to London. Terra-cotta casts of some of these portions have been placed in the building. The frieze of the east and south sides was found and replaced when the building was reërected. The figures of the frieze are damaged beyond recognition. The composition cannot be made out and but little idea can be formed of the character of the work as a work of art.¹

woman in front of whom a maiden has thrown herself down, eighty drachmæ (about \$15).” “Phyromachos, the Kephisian, for the man with a staff standing near an altar, sixty drachmæ (about \$12); the same, for the man driving; the same price, etc., etc.” Interesting deductions may be drawn from the simplicity of these inscriptions contrasted with their elevated position on the temple. The fragments of the figures and of the inscriptions are in Athens.

¹ I do not consider it profitable to follow Friederichs, or any other writer, in a detailed description of this frieze.

It has unfortunately passed away from the reach of proper investigation, or solid judgment. From the scraps that are left, it is evident that on the eastern side, the side of entrance to the temple, there was an assemblage of personages who may have been divinities, and that the other sides were occupied with representations of combats in which certain participants appear with Asiatic garments and weapons. The action, though kept within better limits than at Phigalia, is wild, if not

THE BALUSTRADE.

50*a*. The Niké temple stood on a platform to the right of the steps leading up to the Propylæa. This platform was reached by other steps starting at right angles to the main steps. The sides of the temple were not parallel to the edge of the platform. Its north-west corner was close to the edge; its south-west corner some feet from it. The side towards the main steps of the triangular space thus formed on the platform was guarded by a marble balustrade surmounted by a metal grating. On the balustrade, and facing the temple, were sculptured figures of winged Victories who were supposed to be gathered to serve the deity of the temple, and who were represented engaged in filling their various offices. Several fragments belonging to the balustrade were discovered in 1835 at the time of the reconstruction of the temple; others have been found since. One slab bears the image of Minerva and was probably the central slab.¹

Another has nearly the entire figure of a Victory which evidently held something in the right hand which has been broken off. A left arm has been found which is erecting a helmet as a trophy and which seems to have belonged to a figure that faced the first Victory. The two un-

exaggerated. Figures are slight, at times elegant. Many technical errors are evident.

The frieze of the Theseus temple, the frieze of Phigalia, and this frieze, recall pictures on early vases, and show that from the first there existed in Greek art a school of heroic and violent representation which was at no time influenced by that "moderation" which is the highest supposed quality of Greek sculpture. Whether the school ever produced works of great importance and merit is uncertain, as all the specimens extant are evidently subordinate and decorative. From the fact that ancient authors mention no works of importance that may have belonged to this heroic school it may be concluded that the school was always subordinate, and its productions only ornamental. Still the distinct existence and the vitality of the school must be acknowledged, and may be accepted as additional proof of the fact, that the original elements of barbarism were never entirely eliminated from Greek civilization.

¹ I have not seen this slab and have no idea where it is. I supposed it to be in Athens, but did not succeed in finding it.

doubtedly erected a trophy together. A third slab contains a Victory bringing a greave to be added to the trophy. A large slab containing two Victories and an ox may have been next in place to the trophy slabs, though no sequence can be definitely established. The ox, somewhat untamed, is held with a rope by one of the Victories who braces herself with her foot against a stone; the other, in front of the ox, is in lively action apparently hurrying forward. Still another slab contains a most graceful figure in the act of removing her sandal. Finally there is one on which appear the crossed knees of a figure holding an object that may be a helmet.

No traces of color were found, but as the marble does not give necessary details it is supposed that they were supplied by color; the wings, for instance, are flat surfaces; parts of the drapery, too, seem as if prepared for color. The figures were also evidently decorated with bronze ornaments.

The style of the figures is later than that of the best periods. It is characterized by plumpness of form and by richness of detail. A marked peculiarity is the adhesion of drapery to form, emphasizing form and making its lines more evident. In some of the figures this treatment produces charming effects, though simplicity is sacrificed and the senses are directly addressed.

The figures cannot all be by the same hand. The Victory loosing her sandal, one of the most graceful figures of ancient art, shows, for instance, a far different technique from that of the figures in the scene with the ox. In the former the folds of the drapery are sharp as in the figures in the pediments of the Parthenon. In the latter they are more round, nor are the finer materials of the undergarments at all indicated. The former figure is far superior both in conception and in execution.

The sculpture of the balustrade may be safely referred to the beginning of the fourth century.¹

¹ There are so many copies of these marbles that they must have early enjoyed great renown. The peculiar position of the Victory

FUNERIAL, VOTIVE AND OFFICIAL
RELIEFS.*FUNERIAL RELIEFS.*

51. When describing a few of the funereal monuments of the early style, the fundamental idea of Greek funereal sculpture was indicated. The Greek tombstone is a memorial tablet intended to show forth to posterity in a poetic yet characteristic manner the life and the occupation of the deceased. The majority of Roman tombstones show the same intention. But the Roman differ from the Greek, at least from those of the best periods, in that they perpetuate only the material and prosaic relations of life, the trade of the deceased for instance; while Greek tombstones are poetic, sentimental, and excite a keen sympathy. These are not, however, suggestive of immortality but refer entirely to the past; for the mass of the Greek people had not the happy confidence that looks beyond death. The key-note of these compositions is, therefore, grief not hope, but a grief that is always moderate and gentle; a sorrow rather than a suffering. They present, therefore, a strong contrast to the inordinate wailing depicted on Etruscan tombstones.

loosing her sandal probably illustrates that form of worship in which the worshipper was compelled to remove the sandals, all the while keeping the eyes on the image of the divinity worshipped. On many copies the whole scene is given, the figure of the god in front of this figure, and behind the god, another figure crowning him. On copies of the scene with the ox, the figure in front has in her right hand an object supposed to be a censor. The sculpture of the balustrade shows a wide departure from the severe purity of early art, and must be referred to a time when art had commenced to make its appeals directly to the senses. The adhesion of drapery to form is not true. The effect is to enhance the sensual value of the nude. The figures are very beautiful, no more beautiful curves of flesh or folds of garments exist in art; but this beauty has no trace of the dignity and noble purity of the figures of the Parthenon. A full century may have separated this art from the art of Phidias.

The majority of Greek tombs are the work of mere stone-cutters; for so great a want could only be met and supplied by hand-work. But the artisan depends on the artist; if he does not compose, he imitates. So in many funereal reliefs the conceptions and compositions of great artists compensate for poor execution.¹

THE VILLA ALBANI RELIEF.

Found about 1764 in Rome not far from the triumphal arch of Gallienus in a vineyard belonging to the Duke of Caserta.

¹ I cannot agree with Friederichs that these tombs are not suggestive of immortality. To me they offer abundant proof of the existence among the common people of Greece of a belief in the future and blessed state of the soul.

The majority of tombs may be divided into two classes; the heroic and the pathetic. The heroic, where the deceased warrior is represented in actual combat; set forth as still discharging in full life the duties of his profession; and the pathetic, where the deceased is by pose and gesture giving comfort and assurance to sorrowing relatives.

A great variety of scenes is represented, but on no tombs of the best period which I have examined can be found expressed the idea of death as an end; and on many, immortality seems more clearly set forth than in Plato or Æschylus.

The tomb inscribed with the names of Demetria and Pamphile is a convincing example. It was discovered but a few years ago in Athens by the side of the sacred way, and was still *in situ* when I saw it in 1878. A majestic female is seated on a chair ornamented with the sphinx and ram's head, the symbols of death; by her side stands her friend and companion. The figures are in high relief and stand boldly out from the background. They look fully to the front. It may have been imagination, but it seemed to me that this must be the tomb of two friends who had met death together, and that in image and attitude were expressed the sentiments with which the message to depart was received. The summons may have come unexpectedly, but it found them prepared. There is no surprise in their countenances. There is readiness to obey. No fear, but rather a glorified expectancy, as if bright rays from the next world had already reached them.

On the architrave are the two names and nothing more. No enumeration of virtues; no reference to ancestry; not even a death-date to suggest interrupted life. Christian art has not given a more full, satisfactory and simple expression of its most blessed hopes.

Recent discoveries have so increased the number of these monuments that Friederichs' list cannot be followed, and only a few of the most important and most typical works can be described.

So many similar reliefs have been found of late which are evidently funereal that this relief must belong to the same class. It undoubtedly ornamented the grave of a warrior and commemorated one of his glorious achievements. No livelier representation of a victor could have been conceived; for he has sprung from his horse to give his antagonist a death-blow: no more hopeless attitude than that of his foe; for, without defence, he interposes his mantle vainly hoping it may serve as a shield. This is one of the most beautiful of all funereal reliefs. It was probably stolen on account of its beauty. To judge by the style, it is of somewhat later date than the frieze of the Parthenon but not as late as the fourth century B.C., when pathos and passion were expressed in the face; that is, if a conclusion may be drawn from the sculpture of the Mausoleum. The tightly pressed lips of the victor and the slightly open and complaining mouth of the victim are early forerunners in the expression of sentiment.

In contrast to the majority of funereal reliefs this one must have been the work of a recognized artist.¹

ATTIC FUNERAL VASE IN THE GLYPTOTHEK AT MUNICH.

The foot and the mouth are modern. Such vases were formerly called Marathon vases, but they are found in various parts of Attica and even outside of Attica.

¹ The tomb of Dexileos, discovered in 1872 on the sacred way leading from Athens to Eleusis, is of this same character and of not inferior execution. The inscription it bears is as follows:

"Dexileos, son of Lysinias, of Thoricos, was born under the archonship of L(P?)isander. Died under Eubolidos. He was of the five knights of Corinth." Eubolidos was archon in B.C. 394. Dexileos was probably killed in one of the many conflicts that took place on the Isthmus of Corinth during the Peloponnesian war, and may have been one of five knights who are reputed to have especially distinguished themselves for valor.

The frieze represents a combat in which a victorious horseman has brought to the ground an antagonist who, while supporting himself with his left arm, raises the right for protection. The scene is full of vivacious action. The monument is one of the most beautiful and interesting of those as yet discovered.

The custom of placing urns on tombs was derived by the Romans from the Greeks, and from the Romans it has descended to modern times. When cremation existed in Greece the ashes of the deceased were placed in an urn; and though the urn was generally buried, it was sometimes placed on a pillar. When cremation was discontinued urns were still used but only symbolically; they were no longer hollow but solid, and consequently of no practical use. Their form changed also. Early urns, made for containing ashes, are high and small, similar to the vases which were placed in, and about, graves; later and symbolical urns are large, with small foot and neck.

The urn in question is of comparatively early work. It is without the ornamentations of a later period; besides, the upper side is sharp while in later vases the upper side is rounded to correspond with the lower. The handle is not pierced but solid, to strengthen the small neck. Traces of red and black were found.

The character of the relief and the letters of the inscription refer the urn to the best period of sculpture; that is, to the beginning of the fourth century. The seated woman "Eukoline," who occupies the centre of the composition, is evidently the deceased. The man who stands facing her and who holds her hand is probably the husband. Above him is inscribed the name "Onesimos." Behind the woman is a male figure inscribed "Chaireas." An attendant and two children complete the group. One of the children stands by its mother and stretches out its little hand to testify to its affections.

Family scenes, such as the one here represented, frequently occur on Greek tombs, and give clearer and more attractive views of Greek domestic life than can be had from literature. It is impossible to regard such representations as works of pure phantasy. They are pictures of real things, and prove that in whatever Greek family-life may have been defective, it was beautified by affection and confidence.

TOMB OF AMEINOKLEIA.

In the New Museum at Athens. The deceased is named in the inscription "Ameinokleia, daughter of Andromenes." She is standing and has a veil about her head, for maidens as well as matrons were veiled. A servant wearing a cap — the sign of servitude — puts on her sandals; another with a casket stands behind the first.

The same change from flat to high relief occurs in funereal sculpture that has been already observed in temple sculpture. The high relief of this tomb indicates a late period and a realistic art tendency. The execution, as usual in tombstones, is ordinary. Quite singular is the manner in which the form of the servant arranging the sandals fits into the form of the other. The composition is very pleasing, and the tomb undoubtedly belongs to a good art period. The inscription in which "o" stands for "ou" indicates a date subsequent to 400 B.C.¹

THE PIRÆUS TOMBSTONE.

Found at the Piræus in 1839; now in the New Museum at Athens. A family scene, of which the central figure

¹ In this monument, departure is expressed with realism. The deceased is being prepared by her attendants as if for a walk. One fits her sandals; another brings money or ornaments for the journey. The box, or casket, appears on many tombs and is not yet well understood. It may have contained the sacred "oboloi" put under the tongue of the dead — Charon's ferry fare.

The composition is harmonious and the design graceful. The workmanship is rude. Parts are unfinished; for instance, the left hand of the attendant holding the casket and both hands of the other attendant. The right hand of the standing attendant expresses admirably a doubt as to the most suitable ornament. Noticeable is the action by which the deceased balances herself by resting her right hand upon the head of the kneeling attendant. So far as my observation extends, sandals worn by the dead are without straps.

There is no expression of death in this scene. It is as if the daughter of the house were being prepared for a short journey, from which she was soon to return with the renewal of the joy and gladness of her presence.

is a seated woman who is probably the deceased. The child held by an attendant indicates that it is a young mother who is the object of the grief of relatives and attendants. The motive of the composition is a showing forth of the regards and affections which accompanied the deceased through life.

The figure in front of her extends a hand. This gesture, so often mistaken for a gesture of parting, is most clearly a sign of deep attachment; so the Romans understood it, for they often represent man and wife hand in hand on the tomb of either. Some modern artists have also rightly interpreted it. The casket, so often seen on tombs, is on the deceased's lap.

The pure style of the composition, and the tender and subdued expressions of the faces, point to the beginning of the fourth century B.C.¹

TOMBSTONE OF THE DAUGHTER OF ONESIMOS.

[Of the tombstones discovered in Athens since 1870 no one gives a more beautiful picture of family affection than that of the daughter of Onesimos. On it the whole family, to the house dog, is represented as assembled.

¹ The slab is imperfect. One figure, at least, is wanting, as appears from the hand which rests on the back of the chair. The scene is simple and easily understood. The seated figure is much larger than the others, not only because she is the principal figure, but for the sake of isokephalism. The figure in front of the deceased is probably her husband. He would attract to himself her last thoughts which seem given to the child. He raises his right hand to his face with a gesture of sadness. This gentle gesture is the extremest expression of sadness that appears on Greek tombs of the best art periods. In contrast to his gesture, his wife's expression is most serene and happy. The ram's head and the sphinx on the arm-chair are Eleusinian symbols of death and may show the Egyptian origin of the Eleusinian mysteries. The thoughts suggested by this group are similar to those which arise from reading the *Phædon* of Plato; but the sculptor surpasses the philosopher in the simplicity and the convincing grace with which he presents immortality.

Portraiture is not to be looked for on tombs of this period. Even the statues erected to victorious athletes were not portraits; they only symbolized the valor of the conquerors.

The deceased, a little girl, stands on the right in front of her father. A little dog jumps up for recognition. In the little girl's right hand is an object that looks like a pet bird. The father has his hand to his face in gentle expression of grief. On the left, partially facing the little girl, is a full-grown sister who with her left hand pats the little one on the chin and extends her right hand to her little sister's right arm. Back and between the two is another sister who raises her left hand to her head, gently bent in loving sympathy. The face of the child has been so much injured that the expression is not clear, but attitude and gesture show fearless expectancy. On the architrave are three names: "Pritanœ, Nikostrape, Eukoline," a name over the head of each of the three maidens. In the pediment over the architrave "Onesimos, son of Onetoros, the Lesbian." From the character of the letters the tomb may be assigned to the third century B.C. The three maidens are probably daughters of Onesimos, and all the names are given to show that in death there is no separation. The tender love of the elder daughter is beautifully rendered, and the whole scene is filled with a most gentle and sweet idea of death. — *Ed.*]

THE TOMB OF HEGESO.

[This tomb, discovered in Athens in 1870, is from a purely artistic point of view one of the most interesting so far found. It still stands (1879) where discovered, on the site of the supposed sacred way to Eleusis, just outside the gates of the city. On the right a seated maiden contemplates a chain she has taken from a box brought to her by an attendant. Her head is slightly bent, giving her a most graceful attitude. Her drapery is rich and contrasts effectively with the simple garments of the attendant. The workmanship is admirable and worthy to be compared with that of the frieze of the Parthenon. The relief is lower than in most tombs, showing thereby, perhaps, a nearer approach to the best art period. The

picture presented might well be that of a bride arraying herself for her wedding. — *Ed.*]¹

VOTIVE RELIEFS.

52. The surest sign of a votive relief — in the absence of an inscription — is the discrepancy in the relative size of gods and men. On other works of art gods and men appear as similar beings; on votive reliefs a distinction is marked by giving the divinity a far greater stature. This distinction is necessitated by the very nature of the work. A votive relief is a thank-offering for benefits received by a servant from his lord, and the donor represents himself small in stature for the purpose of better expressing his dependence and his humility. The same principle appears in Italian painting of the fourteenth century where donors are represented very small that their insignificance in comparison with divinity may be conspicuous.²

¹ There are tombs of a different character on which the deceased is represented reclining at a banquet with the various members of his family about him. Sometimes the composition is so simple that nothing more than a family meal can be made out of it; then it is evident that the deceased is being honored with worship as a god of the lower world. He is sometimes crowned with the modius which is the especial insignia of the divinities of the lower world. In the centre of the scene sometimes stands an altar to which members of his family lead animals to be sacrificed, while a boy in garments of priestly service pours libations of wine; others burn incense, etc., etc. The wife is generally of larger size than the others and is closer to the deceased. Frequently a serpent, as the guardian of graves, shares the libation. A horse's head is often introduced to show, perhaps, that the deceased was of equestrian rank.

These tombs are far less attractive than the former ones which seem to appeal so strongly to the sympathies of modern religious faith.

The whole subject of Greek tombs is of great and of growing interest. It is not too much to say that their study may change long-established ideas as to the prevalent belief of the most gifted people of antiquity.

² So far but few of these reliefs have been discovered; and they have little value as works of art. They are usually small in size and present a god or goddess, and the donor or donors. Beneath, above, or about, the donors are inscribed their names. The divinity is

OFFICIAL RELIEFS.

53. A most characteristic custom of the Greeks was the ornamenting of tablets on which public decrees, etc., were inscribed with reliefs illustrative of the import of the document. The only object was to give the decrees artistic embellishment, as the reliefs do not assist in interpreting. Such ornamenting is peculiarly Hellenic. The Greek disliked to present any object in its plain and practical dress untouched by poetry or art. Even the milestones about Athens greeted the traveller with pleasant words of encouragement, telling him that he was near his journey's end and should therefore be light-hearted and gay.

Official reliefs are very hard to explain. The accompanying decree has frequently disappeared, and where preserved it often throws but little light on the sculpture; for it is evident that the artist must have made frequent appeals to the imagination in illustrating dry official sentences.¹

usually seated and in, or in front of, a small temple. These reliefs do not present the particulars of cures which characterize modern votive pictures hung about Roman Catholic shrines; they are, however, about as uninteresting as works of art, and perhaps equally interesting as evidence of faith in an unseen and supernatural power.

The majority of those so far discovered are dedicated to Cybèle. They are about eighteen inches high by twelve inches broad. The goddess is generally represented seated in a small temple, crowned with a modius, or with the crenelated crowning more especially characteristic of the goddess, with a tymbal in her left hand, the dish for receiving offerings in her right, and a diminutive lion on her lap. The donors appear in low relief on the pilasters of the temple. Above them, their names, to which is added "*Μῆτρι θεῶν*," Cybèle is also quite frequently represented standing in a grotto with a male figure by her side who is supposed to be Atys by some critics, Hermes Kadmilos, by others. The appearance of Cybèle on so many of these reliefs is unpleasantly suggestive, and does not encourage one to pursue their study. A few have been found with Minerva as the divinity adored; a few with Mercury, and a few with other gods or goddesses.

¹ A sufficient number of these reliefs has been found to establish their character but not to permit classification or to allow general deductions. On some of them Minerva extends her hand to a lesser

PERIOD OF THE HIGHEST DEVELOPMENT.

*SECOND DIVISION OF THE PERIOD, B.C. 400 TO
B.C. 300.*

The second half of the period of the highest development of Greek sculpture is not so richly represented in modern collections as the first. Especially limited is the number of absolutely authentic works. Though, as already stated, the authorship of no one work of the first half can be fully proved, still the sculpture of the Parthenon, and notably the statues from the pediments, establish the characteristics and peculiarities of the style, show the perfection it reached, and clearly expose the elements of that perfection.

No one work has been recovered from the second half of the period that can be compared with the Parthenon marbles in extent and importance, or as representative of the highest development of the style. There are, however, existing copies of important works, and original works of lesser importance, from which the style may be known, though its highest excellences are not illustrated.

The chief peculiarity of the style is the representation of the life of the soul.

Greek history of the time is characterized by a gentle,

personage who represents the state, or island, with which Attica makes a treaty; the terms of the treaty being in the decree which the relief adorns. Sometimes Minerva is seen crowning an individual whom the decree states to have merited and obtained reward for some well-doing. One singular relief found in Athens and preserved in the New Museum ornaments a species of balance-sheet presented by the custodian of the treasures kept in the Parthenon. On this relief Minerva shakes the hand of a stately figure who may be supposed to represent the city of Athens: the hand-shaking testifying approval of the manner in which the treasures have been guarded.

The reliefs so far discovered are small and of poor workmanship, though well conceived and undoubtedly belonging to a good art period.

if not an effeminate, spirit, strongly in contrast to the heroic spirit of the time of Phidias. Art in sympathy leaves the gods and draws nearer to man. Greek sculpture during the period reaches the highest subjectivity of which it was capable. At the same time it gives most lively outward expression to pathos, to passion, and to the awakened life of the soul. In works of Attic origin — and the majority of those preserved are Attic — there still lingers some of the earnestness and severity of former times.

Nobility and dignity are still important elements. They continue to oppose complete naturalness and still prefer a simple and severe technique. The dryness of the former style has, however, completely disappeared, and a milder and gentler feeling makes itself manifest. The one signal advantage that this period has over former periods results from the fact that now for the first time the head — the true bearer of the soul's expressions — is developed in its full beauty. Now for the first time are true soul-full heads possible.

This statement will not appear singular if the general development of former art be considered.¹

The typical face of the old style could well be followed by that earnest and severe face of the Phidian period which is best illustrated by the Torlonia Vesta and the Naples Juno, but not by the mild and soul-full beauty of the period under discussion of which the Munich Eirene is so lovely an example. Historic necessity caused the heads of the Phidian period to follow those of archaic times. In the Phidian period archaic reminiscences still linger; the archaic smile does not entirely disappear. Indeed, in the battle-scenes of the friezes of Phigalia and of the Theseus temple there are still heads that express total indifference.²

¹ The use of masks on the Athenian stage shows how little attention was paid to facial expression, and how singularly it was disregarded as a means of conveying the soul's sentiments. Still more singular is it that masks should have continued to be used after art had shown the close connection between sentiment and expression.

² I have translated these passages literally, because I do not under-

The differences between the styles of the two periods of highest development flow naturally from differences of history and culture. So happy a time as the time of Phidias, when traditions were accepted and the faith and customs of ancestors honored, had no inclination to examine the processes of the inner life, and was blessedly free from such wild conflicts of the soul's emotions as attended the unhappy circumstances of later times. So in the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, the life of the soul has deeper and more impressive expression than in those of Æschylus. The Peloponnesian war is the great turning-point that changes Greek art, Greek literature, and all other manifestations of Greek culture.¹

The works to be considered will be divided into two classes: first, mythological subjects; then, historical subjects, genre, etc.

stand what Friederichs means here by historic necessity. The course of art development is one thing; quite another, that art should have been forced into a particular course by the necessities of history.

The faces of early art were incorrect in feature, but they smiled in recognition of life and sentiment. They have a certain sprightliness, which entirely disappears during the Phidian period. There was no historic necessity to delay the development of expression, or to interfere with its expanding directly from the archaic smile. There is no historic reason why the representations of the gods during the Phidian period should not have had human expressions as well as human forms and attitudes. The fact that they had not is a distinct and independent fact of artistic sequence; and not one of historic necessity.

¹ Sophocles made his reputation in B.C. 468 by defeating Æschylus. Euripides won the first prize in B.C. 441. The latter of these dates is nine years before Sparta and her allies voted for war.

Commencement of Peloponnesian war, B.C. 431.

Athens captured and long wall destroyed, B.C. 404.

Birth of Alexander the Great, B.C. 356.

Battle of Chæroneæ, and subjugation of the Greeks by the Macedonians, B.C. 338.

More prominent artists of this period: *Kephisodotos*, an Athenian, grandson (?) of Alkamenes and father (?) of Praxiteles; flourished about B.C. 390-370. — *Praxiteles*; dates of birth and death unknown; flourished about B.C. 360. — *Scopas*, a native of the island of Pharos, then subject to Athens; flourished about B.C. 395-350. — *Lysippus*, of Sicyon in Argolis; flourished about B.C. 372-328.

Mythological Representations.

It was stated in the introduction to the preceding part of this work that statues of this particular period have less religious character than those of the fifth century. A Venus in the act of bathing and an Apollo playing with a lizard have been found. Such statues could not, of course, have been executed as objects of worship. They show that the gods were beginning to be conceived of as engaged in the occupations of daily life and as endowed with strictly human attractions. Only the beginnings, however, of such a tendency are manifested; for in general a certain amount of religious feeling is preserved. In some works, the Juno Ludovisi for instance, it is hard to tell whether the divine or the human is the more strongly expressed; whether dignity or grace is preëminent. Religious character no longer appears so pure and so undefiled, and consequently is not so impressive. But even from a religious point of view the addition of human graces cannot be in every case a loss; for a full conception of some of the Grecian divinities must include love in its least divine and most human aspect. Plastic art is therefore, for the first time faithful to a full conception. In the Torlonia Vesta, in the Naples Juno, in the Phidian marbles, and in the Eleusinian relief, there is not a shadow of that love which shines forth so sweetly in the Munich Eirene.

EIRENE AND THE CHILD PLUTOS, FORMERLY CALLED LEUCOTHEA.

54. A marble statue formerly in the Villa Albani, taken by the first Napoleon to Paris, and purchased by King Louis of Bavaria when the Paris collection was broken up after Napoleon's fall. It is at present in the Glyptothek at Munich.

The right arm of the woman, the fingers of her left

hand, both arms of the child, and the jug, are restorations. The head of the child is antique, but not the original head.¹ The folds of the garments and the muscles of the nude furnished a correct guide for restoring the arms. The gesture of the right hand of the woman is, however, hardly correct. As the group is undoubtedly of divine beings the upturning of the fingers is not in keeping. The gesture conveys the idea that the hand held a toy which the child desired, and towards which he was reaching; too petty a motive for a group of such impressive dignity. The figure more probably held a sceptre. There is in existence an Athenian coin on which an identical group is engraved, and in which the sceptre appears.² The gesture of the right arm of the boy is a happy conception and must be correct. It expresses childish affection, to which the gently bending head of the woman admirably replies. On the other hand it is hard to say how the left hand of the boy and the left hand of the woman were arranged, and whether the hand of the woman held any attribute. The jug is an arbitrary restoration, only justifiable on the supposition that the boy is Bacchus. The left hand of the woman more probably held the child, for otherwise his seat would have been insecure.³ Winckelmann accepted the jug as a part of the original work, and named the group *Leucothea* and the infant *Bacchus*. His various reasons for this nomenclature were hardly tenable at the time when they were advanced and have long since been refuted. Apart from other considerations, the woman is of far too noble an

¹ Part of the nose of the woman and some of the folds of her garment, the left foot of the child and part of the right one, are also restorations. The head of the child is of Parian marble, while the rest of the group is Pentelic.

² On the same coin the boy holds a horn of plenty in his left while the woman supports him with her left.

³ Friederichs can hardly have seen the coin to which he refers or he would not indulge in conjectures. The coin is small and abraded, but the identity with the group is unmistakable, and both attitudes and gestures are clear and are as already stated.

aspect to be a mortal or even a nymph. The sceptre, which must be imagined in her right hand, characterizes her as a goddess, and her form indicates that she was a matronly divinity. Her full locks would suggest Gæa, but do not suffice for identification. The theme of the composition is undoubtedly motherly love; the love of a divine mother for her child. Another thing seems clear: the names of the figures are not to be sought for in the circle of allegorical, but in that of mythological, beings; that is, those beings who were conceived of as persons, for such tender and personal affection could hardly be attributed to abstract or impersonal beings.

The composition is of the highest beauty. The heads approach, so do the hearts. The group affects as do the representations of the Christian Madonna. The drapery shows a happy combination of order and accident, grace and dignity. It corresponds perfectly with the drapery of the very best periods; with the drapery of the Caryatides of the Erechtheum for instance.

Judging from the character of the work, and accepting the authority of the coin already mentioned, the group must be accepted as Athenian, and as an original of the first rank. It is of the highest value in estimating all phases of ancient art. In no work of art that has been preserved is there such depth and warmth of feeling; yet the expression is all well within the limits of sculpture. As on the Orpheus relief, and as on some of the tombstones of the best period, so here, a slight gesture gives full and satisfactory expression to the deepest emotions.

The reserve in the expression of feeling, the control of its full and natural overflow by a high and noble reticence, are characteristics that assign a date this side of the beginning of the fourth century. The opinion that the group belongs to the Phidian period arose at a time when nice comparisons were impossible, and when critics were satisfied with general and abstract views. In the Phidian period archaisms still lingered, nor does any one work show the tender sensibilities and affections, which are the

theme of this charming group. The fourth century too, according to accounts, seems to have been the especial time when mothers' joys and mothers' sorrows afforded themes for representation.¹

NIOBE AND HER CHILDREN.

55. A number of marble statues discovered in 1583 in Rome not far from the Church of St. John Lateran. Cardinal Ferdinand dei Medici bought them, and placed them in his villa on the Pincian hill. In 1775 the statues were removed to Florence. Since 1794 they have been in the Uffizi in an apartment especially prepared for their reception.

The most important of these works is the group of Niobe and her youngest daughter.

Of the figure of Niobe, the nose, the point of the upper lip, nearly the whole of the under lip, a part of the chin, the left forearm with the drapery about it, the right hand, and part of the right forearm, are restorations. The original right hand was placed lower, so as to show more of the daughter's head. Of the daughter, the hair, the right arm, the left hand, and the left foot, are also restorations. Abrasions would seem to indicate that the original left hand of the daughter was deeper down in the mother's drapery.

The daughter sinks on her knees against her mother, clings to her with one arm, and with the other emphasizes the appeal for pity which fills her supplicating eyes.

¹ After the peace of 371 B.C. between Sparta and Athens a form of worship was instituted at Athens in honor of the goddess of peace, Eirene; and Kephisodotos, undoubtedly in connection with this worship, is reputed to have executed a bronze statue of Eirene bearing in her arms the youthful Plutos, thus symbolizing Peace as the true mother of prosperity. The Munich statue may be a careful copy of this work. The similarity of the motive to that of the group recently discovered at Olympia, of Mercury and the child Bacchus, by Praxiteles, strengthens the supposition that Kephisodotos was Praxiteles' father.

See Heinrich Brunn's *Catalogue of the Marbles of the Glyptothek*, No. 96.

The mother has rushed forward to meet her; she could not have stood still while her daughter was flying to her for protection. It is very clear exactly how the group was conceived. Niobe, not to be hindered in her haste, had seized her outer garment with both hands. The left hand is still performing this duty. The right, at the very moment the child falls, drops the part of the garment it holds and extends itself for protection over the daughter. The knees of the mother bend together about the daughter, and her form bows down for still greater protection. The action is the involuntary expression of a mother's love. Niobe knows, however, that she has no pity to hope for. She alone knows the reason for the terrible destiny that is being enacted before her very eyes. The children's agony is that which accompanies unexpected catastrophes. Terror partially deprives them of the use of their senses. The mother, however, lifts her eyes, not with agony, but with intensest grief, to those whom she knows to be the authors of her afflictions.

In studying the expression of the face of the Niobe, the line of the eyebrows is of special importance. The brows are elevated where they approach one another, and are depressed on the outer side of the eyes. The same arrangement is often seen on tragic masks.

In contrast to the large proportions of the mother, in whose form and features pride may still be recognized, is the delicate and gentle figure of the fleeing maiden. The artist has clothed her with a thin, tightly fitting, linen, under-garment; so that in contrast to the background, formed by the rich masses of the mother's drapery, she appears almost naked. His object was to increase the pathos of the scene by making form to appear still more delicate, youthful, and appealing.

This group undoubtedly formed the centre of the composition. The figure of Niobe is not only far larger than any natural differences in size between mother and children calls for, but the action of the figure is to the front and not to the side. In most of the other figures

the action is to the side, and several figures are presented in profile. Niobe occupied, therefore, the centre of the action which on either side was directed towards her.¹

To Niobe's left is the figure of another daughter. Of this statue, the right arm, half of the left arm, and half of both feet, are restorations. The restorations are correct, as sufficient portions remained to serve as a sure guide.

The daughter was hurrying away, her outer garment held by both hands, as in the case of Niobe; suddenly an arrow strikes her in the neck and arrests her flight. The upper part of her body bends forward in pain, her head sinks back, her left hand seems to clutch at the wound, while the right arm falls powerless by her side. This figure, in expression and in the management of drapery, is a model of simplicity and nobility. Most skilful is the manner in which is indicated that the left hand has but just dropped that part of the garment it was holding. The beautiful and touching face has been often repeated in later art, especially on canvas by Guido Reni.

The figure which in Florence is placed on the right of Niobe can hardly have made part of the composition. There is no family resemblance in the features. The hair is more wiry than that of the other statues. There are differences in the drapery; the base on which it stands is peculiar. It has been supposed that if not a daughter the figure may be that of a nurse or serving-woman, as a companion piece to the figure of the pedagogue which appears in the group; for both nurse and pedagogue appear in other Niobe representations. But if a nurse, she would not have been represented so ideal in character and so young in appearance. Nurses are generally represented as old, and of not attractive features; for they,

¹ I shall take the figures as they are arranged in Florence, and not as the plaster casts are arranged in the Berlin Museum. Friederichs of course follows the latter order. On account of the different arrangement I shall not be able to follow F. very closely, and must intersperse largely. The original grouping is entirely a matter of conjecture.

as well as pedagogues, were generally taken from the order of slaves, and art indicated their condition by an absence of beauty. Another point against the figure is that the left arm and hand are in very much the same position as in the Niobe, a repetition that would not have been permissible in figures placed near to one another in a composition: and this figure, if in the composition, must have been near the centre; for in height it nearly equals Niobe herself. The figure may have belonged to another, and a different, Niobe composition. It appears on an antique gem grouped with a kneeling figure which it is endeavoring to protect with its mantle. The restoration of the right arm is hardly correct. The right hand was probably lower down, holding the mantle where its folds so abruptly break; for otherwise these folds would be unaccountable.¹

Next to this statue is a female figure of nearly equal height clothed in a long garment with sleeves, its hands and upturned head expressing astonishment or expectancy rather than fear. A mantle falls over the back from the right shoulder, one end of it passing over the left arm. This figure, though rejected by most critics, undoubtedly belonged to the composition. The name Melpomene has been generally assigned to it; though, undoubtedly, the eldest of Niobe's daughters is here represented. Sleeved garments are not exclusively typical of the Muses; while so narrow a girdle as the one this figure wears is not found on statues of Melpomene, but is characteristic of Niobe statues. Moreover the position of the left foot, which is on a slight elevation, accords with the position

¹ This figure has given rise to endless discussion. Most writers reject it from the composition. Some group it with the dead son, and conceive it as regarding the body with pity and affection, and as about to remove the mantle to cover it. The differences of opinion may be owing to the numerous restorations. Both arms, and a large part of the right breast, are modern. The head, though an antique, is not the original head, as it is of a different marble from the rest of the figure. The base on which the figure stands is almost entirely modern. In spite of so many restorations the statue is of singular and pathetic beauty and is quite worthy of the artist of the Niobe.

of many of the Niobes and is but remotely suggestive of Melpomene. Finally; the elevation of the head, so appropriate to a Niobe, can hardly be assigned to Melpomene. An apparently conclusive argument is the great resemblance of the forehead and the hair to those of Niobe herself, and to those of one of the other daughters. With the exception of the forehead the features are not particularly true to the Niobe type; this may be owing to changes and restorations. The hands are modern, but undoubtedly correctly restored. The attitude is one of silent acceptance of the inevitable. Certainly it is not unworthy of noble and haughty womanhood to meet unavoidable death without an effort to escape it.¹

Of the youngest son, the right arm and the left hand are modern; of the pedagogue, both arms and the head. These two statues are placed apart in the Florentine collection. In 1831 a marble group of identical figures was discovered at Soissons in France. In it the boy stands in front of the pedagogue, who places his hand on the boy's shoulder as if for protection. This group is now in the Louvre in Paris. This is undoubtedly the original conception; as it would not become a teacher, at least a teacher of the noble character suggested by the

¹ The head of this statue is not original, and some critics are of the opinion that it is not even antique. If modern, however, resemblance to the other heads would have been made more striking. The weight of authority is against Friederichs. I cannot recall another celebrated writer who accepts the statue as belonging to the Niobe group. It has been so much worked over that no valuable opinion of its original character can be found. The breast is at present masculine. An effort may have been made at some time to turn the statue into an Apollo.

The group of Niobe and her youngest daughter, the statue of the daughter wounded in the neck, and the statue of the so-called nurse occupy the end of the Niobe apartment to the right of entrance. The statue last described is the first one from this end along the wall opposite the entrance. The first one from the same end, along the wall of entrance, is the so-called youngest son: a statue that must be considered in connection with the statue of the pedagogue, with which it was undoubtedly grouped. The statue of the pedagogue is directly opposite the group of Niobe and the youngest daughter, occupying the central position of the end of the Niobe apartment to the left of entrance.

tragedy, to forsake his pupil and to think only of his own safety. Nor would the artist have introduced a personage foreign to the catastrophe, unless grouped with one of the victims and for the purpose of making that victim more conspicuous. So in other Niobe representations, nurses and tutors are connected with the children in scenes of tender and affecting sympathy. That the large figure is a pedagogue is inferred from the resemblance to known figures of pedagogues. It also appears from the figure itself. The sleeved garment and the boots give it a practical appearance in strong contrast to the ideal figures of the sons. The head should have been restored more in accordance with the fact that teachers were slaves. It was undoubtedly turned more to one side and raised in astonishment and terror; for neither did the tutor know the cause of the terrible catastrophe. In the Louvre example the pedagogue has his right foot on a slight elevation, giving the action an upward direction. So many figures of the group have this same action that it was probably the original one in this figure.

[Next to the youngest son is the figure of another son. This son appears in full flight, and as if his flight were up the side of a rocky hill. His right foot is placed on a rock at nearly the elevation of the left knee. The body is bent forward, and the right arm is far outstretched, as if the stride he were taking were a desperate one, one requiring the exercise of all his strength. His mantle, falling from his back and his left shoulder, is gathered twice about the left arm, and held so as not to impede his flight. The head is turned to the front and does not seem to accord with the action of the figure; and the rock, on which the right foot is placed, hides almost the whole of the leg from the knee down. Immediately to the left of the door of entrance to the Niobe Hall is a similar figure. In this latter figure, however, the head is turned back as if regarding a pursuer, and the entire figure is turned around so that the spectator perceives its back and not its front. Here, the right leg is not hidden by the rock, and the entire

action is clearly understood. Which is the original position of the head, and whether the statue was to be viewed from in front or from behind, are points in dispute. As the heads of both statues, even if original, have been broken off and replaced, their original positions are unknown. To present the back of a statue is a bold conception. To hide a limb, which is of such importance in understanding the action, is bad composition. Friederichs accepts the statue with the back view and the inverted head as the original conception; Overbeck, the other one. I accept Friederichs' views, because the motive, though violent and strange, is gradually led up to by other figures in the composition.

Between the first of these two figures and the door of entrance are two statues which, from their similarity, are evidently repetitions. A son, stricken to death, falls on his left knee and supports himself with his left hand against a rock. His right leg is stretched out by his side; only the heel of his foot touches the ground. The right hand is clasped against the right hip, and the head is thrown back and turned over the left shoulder. Very singularly, the left leg from the knee down, which would have projected behind, is not given, showing that originally the statue must have been placed against a wall. The youth, in the agonies of death, still holds his body partially erect. The whole figure expresses scorn and defiance. The composition is excellent, and illustrates with great force the undying qualities of pride and hate. Very noticeable is the strong contrast between this figure and those of the daughters who yield to death without a struggle.

To the left of the entrance and along the wall of entrance are arranged four figures; first, the figure already mentioned, then a son between two daughters. The first daughter is a maiden still unwounded; but, arrested in flight by the imminence of danger, she cowers in terror. Her knees bend beneath her, her body sways and partially turns, while she raises her hands in horror and despair.

The arms are modern and the head, though antique, does not belong to the statue. It is not at all of the Niobe type, and is probably the head of a nymph or of a sea divinity. There is a repetition of this statue in the Capitol at Rome, and another in the Louvre at Paris. In the Roman example the arms are differently restored, wings are added, and the figure is called Psyche. The head however, which is original, is of a very decided Niobe type, and the base on which the statue stands is of the rocky character peculiar to these statues. The Capitol statue has led many to call this statue, also, Psyche, and to reject it from the Niobe group. There is on its back a protuberance, showing that at some period of its history it was not only called Psyche, but was furnished with Psyche's wings. The protuberance is, however, of very different marble from the statue, and is comparatively modern. The Louvre statue has wings and is also known as Psyche. The head is of very decided Niobe type. Fröhner, formerly conservator of the antiques of the Louvre, states positively that the protuberances for the wings are parts of the statue. He, however, considers the statue a copy from a Niobe. — *Ed.*]

Next follows a son in flight; his left foot on a rock; his right about leaving the ground; his left arm outstretched, with his mantle wrapped about it and falling from it; his right arm expressing astonishment, and his head turned back to perceive the danger that is following him. This is one of the figures that seem to lead up to, and to justify, the figure with its back turned to the spectator. The action is milder, yet similar and introductory. The only important restoration is the right forearm: its gesture seems too calm for such a tragedy.

Next to this figure, and the last statue on this side of the wall, is a maiden, slightly leaning forward, standing on her toes, her head thrown back, her left hand raised in apparent astonishment, and her right hand gently raising her upper garment from the right knee. The

left arm and the neck are restorations. There is nothing in attitude or technique to recall a Niobe. The statue has been improperly restored, and is undoubtedly a poor copy of a statue that is known as Anchirrhoe. The head should not be elevated. The left arm should extend downwards, the hand holding a water-jug. The completed figure is that of a maiden about to draw water, and slightly holding her garments to keep them from the spring. Copies in Berlin and elsewhere leave no doubt as to the original conception. The various copies point to an original of far later date than the Niobe group.

To the right of the pedagogue, and partially turned towards the end wall, is a figure known as the eldest son. His body is inclined forward, and his left leg is advanced. With his right arm he holds his garments above his head as a shield. The garment falls behind, comes around in front over the left thigh and falls to the ground by the side of the left foot. The left arm, and part of the right forearm with the garment about it, are modern. The drapery on the left thigh appears as if arrested in falling. It has also been very much worked over. Where the new folds appear there was originally an object that held the drapery in place. There is a certain restraint in the action of the statue that excites the supposition that it may have been grouped. The position of the left arm could hardly be accounted for if the figure stood alone.

Attention was called by Canova to a fragment which since the beginning of the century has stood in the Vatican and which explains the position of the Florence statue. It represents a maiden, wounded in the left breast by an arrow, sinking in death against her brother who stands back of her. Of the brother, very little more than the left leg and the drapery about it is preserved; but these parts correspond so exactly with the same parts of the Florentine statue that the identity of the figures is established. The only difference is

that in the Vatican fragment the brother's foot is on a slight elevation. This gives a greater bend to the leg, and offers a position that was probably nearer the original one, as a more natural and impressive attitude is thereby secured for the maiden.

In the Vatican fragment the left foot of the maiden is the only restoration. The head is antique, but not original. It has no resemblance whatever to the Niobe type.

The Florence statue must, therefore, be conceived as grouped in accordance with the Vatican fragment. With his left hand laid sympathetically upon his sister's shoulder he endeavors, with his right, to interpose his garment for protection. In falling, her garments have fallen also. The nude of her tender and girlish form makes the pathos of the scene all the stronger.

The artist has shown great skill in not filling the entire composition with single and independent figures. He has also shown fine sentiment in not depicting every actor as entirely engrossed with his own personal safety. The composition is diversified with groups and contains scenes where selfishness is lost in sympathy and love. Gentler tones than those of fear and terror are heard in the painful accord of the whole.

To the immediate left of the pedagogue, and turned towards the wall opposite the entrance, is the figure of a maiden still unwounded and in rapid flight. The left hand is raised in astonishment, the right reaches over the shoulder and holds the end of the flying mantle. Of this figure, the right arm, the left hand, a part of the left forearm with the adjoining drapery, the left foot, the nose, and the upper lip, are modern.

This figure is far more admirably represented by a copy that formerly stood in the villa of Cardinal Ippolito of Este on the Quirinal hill in Rome, and which is now in the Chiaramonti Museum of the Vatican. It differs from the Florentine copy in many particulars, and shows

itself to be far truer to the original statue. In the first place, the original statue could hardly have had the tight-fitting sleeves which in the Florentine copy reach to the wrists. During the best period of Greek art such sleeves only appear as especial attributes and characteristics to indicate certain divinities or to emphasize certain qualities. During the Roman period, however, such sleeves are of frequent occurrence. Again; in the original, the under garment could not have been turned up and back over the feet as it is in the Florence copy. Short garments, such as worn by Diana, may be blown about by the wind, but in the Florence statue the folds are unnatural.

The larger forms and nobler proportions of the Vatican figure are other proofs of its nearness to the original. The general management of the drapery is of still further assurance. The inner and outer garments are clearly seen to be of different stuffs. The short sleeve of the right arm is of wonderful execution. The delicate folds hang in such beauty that one is insensibly reminded of the figures in the east pediment of the Parthenon. From the waist down, the folds are large, the lines long and sweeping. The Florentine statue, on the contrary, is covered with a multitude of small and unmeaning folds, even where they could not possibly exist in nature; on the left leg, for instance, where owing to the rapidity of the flight the garment would lie flat, and present but few unevennesses. The Florentine statue is a faulty copy; the other, an important work executed with great skill. The skill, too, is so admirably used that it does not call attention to itself but is perfectly subordinate to the conception. Though the artist has tossed and tumbled the maiden's garments, as if a storm had struck them, he only thereby excites a keener sympathy with her despair and agony. Still, even this work is hardly an original. Not that any fault can be found with the workmanship, but the base offers the objection. So great a number of the Niobe statues are placed on uneven bases, representing

rocky and broken ground, that it may be safely concluded that the original statues were so composed. Here the base is smooth and is, moreover, surrounded with the moulding of an Attic column. It must, therefore, be a copy; though no other Niobe statue extant conveys such an exalted idea of the power and majesty of the original work.

Next in order, and along the wall opposite the entrance, is a statue which was known as Narcissus until Thorwaldsen recognized it, and restored it as a Niobe. Fallen to his knees from a blow behind, the youth raises his right arm, while with his left he reaches behind his back towards the fatal wound. The body is bent forward and leans slightly to the right. The head, neck, and right arm, are restorations. Parts of the left arm and hand, though antique, have been broken off and replaced. The right knee is advanced, and indicates that the youth was struck and fell while running.

[Finally, opposite the door of entrance, is the recumbent figure of a dead, or dying, son. He lies on his back on a rock on which is spread his garment, his feet crossed, his left arm on his breast and covering his wound, his right arm about his head as if still engaged in the futile effort of protection. The eyes partially open seem just closing in death. The representation of death is beautifully free from agony; still the absence of all passionate expression causes the statue to differ from the others, and has excited doubt as to its belonging to the group. There is a repetition of this statue in Munich, and another in Dresden. Of the three, the Munich example is by far the finest.¹ The base of the statue is cut away in front. The statue itself is also at an angle, showing that it was to be seen from below and not from above or even on a level. In fact, owing to the position of the right arm, the face can only be well seen from below the level of the body. These are all the statues which belong

¹ No. 141 in Heinrich Brunn's Catalogue of 1876.

to the Florentine collection. There are other and differently composed statues in the various Museums of Europe which are called Niobes, and some of which may be copies of works that belonged to the same composition with the Florentine statues. Of them all the most excellent is a torso in the Glyptothek at Munich, which from Ovid's description of the destruction of the Niobes (*Metam.* vi, 261) has been named Ilioneus. — *Ed.*]

This fragment, discovered in Rome about 1560, passed into the possession of the Hapsburg family and was in the royal palace at Prague until about the close of the last century, when it disappeared. Some years later it was purchased by a Viennese from a stone-cutter who, not knowing its value, sold it for a trifle. In 1814 it was purchased by Prince Louis of Bavaria. It is rightly regarded as one of the chief treasures of the Glyptothek; for it is one of the most beautiful and interesting specimens of ancient art. It represents a youth on his knees, his body slightly bent forward, turned a little to the right, and crouching down on the left. The head and arms are wanting.

There can be no doubt how the torso should be restored. The head and arms were directed upwards and to the right. The youth would ward off a threatened danger. The motive is one therefore well suited to a Niobe. There is indeed on a Niobe sarcophagus preserved in the Vatican a similarly conceived figure.¹ The entire absence of drapery, however, would seem to exclude it from a Niobe composition. All statues that are accepted Niobes are not without drapery: even when nude, drapery is a part of the composition² as is the case with two of the Florentine statues.

The technique of this torso is far superior to that of the Florentine statues. The statue must be the original

¹ I do not see the resemblance. The sarcophagus in question is engraved in Visconti's *Museo Pio Climentino*, iv, 17.

² If this statue be a copy the drapery may have been omitted by the copyist.

work of a celebrated artist. It is of as great importance for the fourth century as are the Parthenon marbles for the fifth. In a comparison with the Ilissus of the west pediment of the Parthenon, each representing a youth of about the same age, the Ilissus seems full of life; this torso full of soul. The gentle life of the very soul seems pulsating in this soft marble. Art has finally succeeded in giving form and substance to the innermost sensibilities and emotions.

Many theories have been advanced as to the arrangement of the original figures in the composition. One theory is that the statues were placed between the columns of a temple. This theory was started by the discovery in Lycia of a temple where such an arrangement actually existed. But in the case of the Lycian temple the statues were all about the same size and were all symbolical, all female, all in similar action. The Niobes, on the other hand, show extreme differences of every description. Between figures destined to fill similar architectural spaces there must be at least similarity of general proportions. Again if the group were divided up by columns it would lose effect; for each figure is an important part of the whole, and the whole is pervaded by a common movement which would be destroyed by interruption. The terror-inspired flight of the children, if arrested by columns, would appear trivial and altogether cease to excite sympathy.

Another theory advanced is that the composition decorated the pediment of a temple. This theory is based principally upon the variety in the heights of the figures. But the figures could not be arranged pedimentarily in any way that would not violate the rules of pediment sculpture. Take the figure of the son stretched out on his back for instance. Imagine this figure either in the centre or in the corner of a pediment. In the first position there would be left above the figure an empty space which could not be filled out by any one of the figures so

far discovered. If the second position were accepted a horizontal figure would be placed where the space imperatively demands a figure but partially recumbent, one bounded by lines parallel to the sides of the angle in which it rests.

No example exists, or could exist, of such a fundamental violation of the law of pediment sculpture.¹

But this is not the only figure which on the pediment theory would violate those laws governing the proper dividing and covering of spaces to which the Greeks, from the beginning of their art history, were more faithful than any other people; without which, indeed, no satisfactory harmony is possible. In a pediment, the lines connecting the heads of figures must be reasonably straight and reasonably paralleled with the obliquely sloping lines of the pediment itself. This rule is the rule in all ancient pediments; and though violations occur in modern art, the propriety and naturalness of the original law are recognized and felt. If the Niobe figures be carefully examined it will be found that it would be impossible to arrange them in obedience to this law.

Three of the sisters and two of the brothers are within less than a foot of one another in height, and the mother is nearly a foot and a half taller than any one of the five.

The supposition has been advanced that heights were adjusted by varying the sizes of the bases. This introduces another objection to the pediment theory. As the bases are now, they are not mere supports to the figures without meaning of their own; but, as in the case of the Farnese bull, they indicate, if not the specific locality, at least the rocky character of the locality, where the tragedy took place. If the bases of the original statues were still more conspicuous and more varied, the idea of the

¹ Some of the pediment theorists would place the outstretched son in front of the so-called nurse. Friederichs pays no attention to those peculiarities of the figure, or of the base on which it rests, which indicate that the position of the spectator must have been below. The outstretched son furnishes, in reality, one of the strong arguments of the pediment theorists.

character of the locality or of the locality itself would have been all the stronger. It is extremely doubtful whether a representing of locality would have been permitted in pediment sculpture; for pediment sculpture must always be in a measure dependent and must carefully preserve a certain decorative character as an ornament to a greater architectural whole. By its bases the Niobe group shows independence, and asks to be judged apart from architectural laws and necessities. In the period of the highest development so picturesque an element as is presented by these bases could not have been permitted in a pediment. Doric severity, which still prevailed, would certainly have rejected such an innovation.

A proper consideration of the bases may even suggest the true arrangement. The mind does not easily accept a horizontal space for the enactment of such a tragedy. As the artist has represented a rocky soil, is it not natural to presuppose an eminence, up and down whose sides the victims are fleeing? The action of several of the figures, especially of two of the sons, necessitates the supposition. The action of these two is upwards; with intense energy they stride upwards. They climb, seeking some higher point for safety. No stone in their way could account for this upward action. It is certainly logical to suppose an eminence upon whose highest top stood Niobe herself.

The composition would gain in picturesqueness. The pathetic character of the group would be especially increased. The flight of the children would appear wilder and more passionate. Following out the idea of the artist we can conceive on top of the eminence the royal residence, the mother's home towards which the children are fleeing for rescue; and the mother, aroused by their cry, coming forth to meet them.¹

Two Niobe groups are mentioned by classic authors.

¹ No Greek artist would have attempted such realism. Artificial mountains, etc., were reserved for the later Bourbons of France and for German princes of the "Zopf" period.

One of these, at least, was arranged in the manner suggested for the Florentine statues. On the doors of the temple of Apollo¹ on the Palatine hill erected by Augustus to celebrate the victory of Actium were two reliefs, one representing the Gauls repulsed from Mt. Parnassus falling headlong from its summit; the other, the death of the Niobes. Symmetry demanded that the two scenes should accord in method of composition; and as the description specifies that the Gauls were being driven from a summit and were, in consequence, necessarily at various altitudes, the Niobes must have been arranged in a similar manner.

The other Niobe group was in Athens,² in a cave over the theatre. The position in a cave suggests that the statues may have been put about at the various elevations of surface which the cave undoubtedly offered.³

As the general order of the composition cannot be established the position of individual figures need not be conjectured. Certain ideas, however, may well be considered. The group must have been of the nature of a high relief; for the general action is on a line. The action of the arms is not only kept within a certain parallelism but in general it accords with the direction in which the figures are going.

On no theory can a group, complete in itself, be arranged from the Florentine statues. If they be divided on the principle that the action of all be directed towards the centre, the two parts will be unequal in numbers and each part will be without artistic consistency. If equality in numbers were to govern the division the result would be still more offensive to the artistic eye.

In attempting a division, direction of action should not be a supreme guide; for the wildness of the scene would be increased if the general direction of a side were occasionally interrupted; though, if the original

¹ Propertius, ii, 31 (iii, 29).

² Pau., i, 21, 5.

³ Rather a far-fetched argument.

group adorned a pediment the interruptions could not have been many or pronounced.¹

The number of children in the original composition has also been a matter of investigation. According to the most generally accepted tradition Niobe had fourteen children; but both in tradition and in art the number varies. No artist would have felt himself bound to any strict enumeration.

Still another question is, whether in the original the gods themselves appeared. To understand the scene it is not necessary that the gods should be visible, but their presence would accord with classic methods of composition. In almost all Niobe representations that are in existence, or that are mentioned by classic authors, the destroying divinities are present. It is a general rule that when the incidents of mythology are presented by poets or artists divinity must be introduced as visible and active.

The faces of the children support the theory of actual presence; for in no one of them is there that expression of wondering alarm which would result if the shafts came from unseen sources; on the contrary, the expression is of that terror which is caused by a fearful sight. Not to be artistically overshadowed by the figure of the mother, the statues of the gods, if present, must have been of great size and of almost inconceivable merit. Their positions are indicated by the glances of the children. The children look upwards and towards each end of the composition.

If, in imagination, the statues be placed on the sides of an eminence; the mother on the highest point; the gods at the sides — perhaps on the other eminences — and the whole be enclosed in an architectural framework, perhaps the best general idea of the composition may be obtained.

Enough has already been said to prove that the Florentine statues are not originals. The workmanship of most of the figures is that of a Roman copyist of a late

¹ Some critics have suggested that the Florentine statues are parts of two groups from the two pediments of a temple; the mother having been the centre of one group; the pedagogue, that of the other.

and bad period. The figures also show such differences that it is evident that the copying was done by various hands and at various times.

The Florentine group is generally accepted as a copy of a work mentioned by Pliny which stood in a temple of Apollo, and about which there was a doubt whether Scopas, or Praxiteles, was the artist.¹ However this may be, the original was certainly Attic, and of the fourth century B.C. Attic peculiarities are strong, even in the copies; and the dramatic and pathetic character of the work points to the fourth century. The same characteristics appear in the marbles of the Mausoleum. Among them is a colossal head that has all the Niobe peculiarities. Still there is nothing in the Niobe group to recall any particular artist, or to justify assigning it to either Scopas or Praxiteles. It is possible that the group mentioned by Pliny may be the one mentioned by Pausanias as standing in a cave over the theatre. Or if the Athenian group were not moved, the Roman group may be a copy of it.²

PASQUINO.

56. [The celebrated fragment called Pasquino is in the Piazza del Pasquino in Rome in a niche against the

¹ Plin. N.H., xxxvi, 28.

² In the present state of the questions excited by the Niobe group individual opinion has little value. I am not inclined to accept Friederichs' notion of an artificial eminence, nor do I believe the group contained figures of the divinities. That the divinities appear to be seen by the children is quite sufficient for the spectator; and the slight unevennesses of the bases sufficiently and artistically indicate a rough and rocky locality. The figures were evidently in the pediment, or pediments, of a building.

The fragment of the fleeing daughter in the Vatican, and the Munich torso are of the highest merit. The Florentine statues are not worthy of the praise that has been lavished upon them. The face of the mother, in which art-writers see such wonderful things, is the work of a weak and sentimental copyist, — nor does the action of the mother appear to me either natural or noble. I should hesitate putting the original of this figure earlier than the third century B.C. The broad faces, and the large cheeks and chins which characterize all the female figures, are not peculiarities of the best periods

Braschi Palace. The legs from the knees down, the right forearm, and the whole of the left arm, are wanting. The fragment has been so battered and bruised that the action can with difficulty be made out, and the merits of the execution can only be perceived after careful examination. Yet the celebrated Bernini (Lorenzo Bernini, 1598–1680, Roman architect and sculptor, foremost artist of his time) pronounced it one of the most excellent antiques in Rome (*"il piu perfetto della natura, senza affettazione dell'arte"*), and modern criticism accepts Bernini's judgment. The dates of its discovery and of its erection to its present position are unknown. The name Pasquino is reported to have been given to it as early as at the end of the fourteenth century from a tailor of the name who lived in the vicinity and who, indulging in the taste of the newspaperless times for lampoons, affixed to the statue those of his own composition. The statue long continued the mouth-piece of the Roman populace. Its attacks were answered from a gigantic statue of a river-god which stood in the Via di Marforio opposite the Mamertine prison and which now forms a part of the fountain in the court of the Capitol.

At various times fragments have been found which accord with the Pasquino and which help the imagination to complete the group of which it was a part. By means of these, and the Pasquino, the original conception can be understood and the excellences of the original work appreciated.

The most important of these fragments are :

1st. A group discovered in a vineyard not far from the Porta Portese in Rome ; purchased in 1570 by Cosmo I, Grand Duke of Tuscany, and now in the Loggia dei Lanzi in Florence. Although this group has been much restored, enough of it is antique to show that the original work represented a figure similar to the Pasquino holding in its arms a dead body. For reasons that will subsequently appear the group is supposed to represent Menelaus, or Ajax, with the dead body of Patroclus.

2d. A group also discovered in Rome about the same time as the former in the ruins of the Mausoleum of Augustus. This group was also acquired by the Grand Duke Cosmo and is now in one of the courts of the Pitti palace. Of it, the legs and the left arm of the standing figure are new ; also the head, arms, and legs, of the other figure. The restorations are fanciful and incorrect.

3d. The head of the standing figure, and the shoulder, and the legs from the knees down, of the other figure ; discovered in 1772 by Gavin Hamilton in the ruins of Hadrian's villa, near Tivoli ; now in the Vatican.

Some forty years ago a Florentine sculptor named Ricci took casts of the original portions of these several fragments, and by skilful combination produced a whole which gives a satisfactory idea of the original work. The left arm of the standing figure and both arms of the other figure do not appear, except as restorations, in any of the fragments. The group, as completed by Ricci, represents a middle-aged helmeted warrior, with his feet apart, bending slightly over his left knee, against which and with his right arm he holds the nude dead body of a more youthful warrior. The head and arms of the dead warrior hang down, his knees are on the ground and his feet extend backwards on the ground between the legs of the other figure. The scene may well be Menelaus, or Ajax, seeking to rescue the body of the slain Patroclus from the advancing and surrounding Trojans. In two particulars the correctness of the Ricci statue may be questioned.

The heads of the Florentine examples have a different direction from the head of the Pasquino and from the head in the Vatican. These turn to the right and look upwards. The Florentine heads are directed to the front. The question arises : which is the original position ? The superior excellence of the workmanship of the Pasquino, observable even in its present condition, is a strong argument for its nearness to the original. Its turning of the head carries out far better the idea of the composition and is moreover of technical advantage. It counterbalances

the tendency of the group to overhang to the front, and at the same time makes the action of the warrior more pathetic and more clear. From the Florentine examples it might be supposed that the warrior was still looking about him for help, or for a way of escape. In the Pasquino, the tragedy is further advanced; for the warrior, despairing of human assistance, raises his eyes to heaven, begging the gods to commiserate the youth and beauty of his departed friend.

The restorations of the left arm of the warrior and that of the left arm of the departed as they appear in the Ricci statue may also be wrong. On antique gems, where the group appears, the warrior bears on his left arm a shield, to which is sometimes added a spear. Such additions may have existed in the original marble group. In the Ricci restoration it is difficult to understand why the warrior does not use both arms in supporting the corpse. Moreover the addition of a spear and shield to the arm of the warrior, who has been rushing to the rescue, would make the group more lively and impressive.

At the time the group was discovered it was the custom to explain ancient art by references to Roman customs; the figures were, accordingly, accepted as gladiators. Modern criticism recognizes them as Grecian warriors.

In one of the Florentine copies the dead warrior has a wound below the right breast. On the Vatican fragment there is a wound between the shoulders.

The original figure may have had both these wounds; and as these wounds correspond with those received by Patroclus—one inflicted by Hector, the other by Euphorbus—the dead warrior has been called Patroclus; and the living warrior Menelaus, as he it was, according to the Homeric narrative, who succeeded in bearing the body away from the fight.

This explanation seems the most probable, because it would be extraordinary if the correspondence of the wounds with the Homeric narrative were accidental. The explanation is in other respects in accord with

Homer. The theory that the upright figure is not Menelaus but Ajax is beset with difficulties. If the figure be Ajax, then the deceased must be Achilles; or if Patroclus, then it must be conceded that the artist used great license in his interpretation of the Homeric narrative and in his conception of the character of Ajax, a character so well defined by both early and late poets. The warrior of the Pasquino statue raises his eyes imploringly to heaven, and is filled with the bitterest grief. How is it possible to recognize in this figure Ajax who, according to Sophocles, regarded lamentation as the cry of a cowardly heart? Of all the Grecian heroes Ajax is the most defiant and the most hard-hearted. He regarded tears as a shame. In such a tragedy his expression would have been one of furious rage. He would have scorned complaint, or an appeal to divinity. So Homer represents him; while Menelaus, in the midst of this very conflict, speaks of the great grief with which his heart is filled. If the figure appear too heroic for Menelaus, it is through the influence of the later tragedians. In Homer he is neither effeminate nor cowardly. Still the question cannot be considered as answered as there are no works in existence that convey any idea of the relative manner in which these two warriors were represented.

The group is a wonderful picture of ancient heroism. It is far finer than the Homeric narrative; for there the supreme moment lacks emphasis, and the emotions of Menelaus are not expressed with such intense concentration. According to the artist's conception Menelaus has seized Patroclus in the very act of falling. All his muscles are strained, while at the same time the deepest grief fills his soul.

The group is also admirable as a generic representation of the character of Grecian heroes. The heroes of the North are wilder, more violent, but know not what it is to grieve. The Greeks are gentler, more natural, more humane. Greek art always represents the death of

a Greek in a gentler and more affecting manner than the death of a barbarian.¹

The composition of the group is of the greatest beauty. Those parts which are technically necessary do not fail to add to the impression of the whole. The hanging arm of Patroclus for instance, which expresses death so eloquently, is technically excellent as an artistic boundary. The contrast between the death-like limbs of Patroclus and the energetic muscular action of Menelaus is not only true to nature but so arranged that the harmony of the whole group is increased.

The nudity of Patroclus is hardly necessitated by that passage in Homer where Apollo is represented as striking off the hero's armor. It is rather in accordance with artistic custom; and here, by making more apparent the youthful beauty of the victim, increases the pathos of his death. In the figure of Menelaus, though the helmet recalls the situation, the garment is purely artistic, serving as a background for the nude Patroclus. On the helmet is a representation of the conflict of Hercules with the Centaurs; on the visor there were dragons which the restorer has turned into eagles with serpents' tails, and on the ear-pieces are animals that cannot be made out. These ornaments may have referred in some way to the life or character of the hero, or they may have been selected as filling properly the spaces they occupy.²

As to the date of the group it is evident that it could not have been executed before sculpture undertook the expressing of dramatic pathos and passion; that is, not before the fourth century B.C. Resemblances have been suggested between the group and the group of the Lao-coön. But, though the two may have some technical points in common, they differ widely in character and

¹ Il., xvi, 855.

² As the Centaurs were especially noted for their attempted abduction of Hippodamia, a representation of their defeat may have been reassuring to Menelaus. The griffin is one of the attributes of Mars, and Menelaus is often called in Homer ἀρηφίλος.

conception. In the Laocoön pure physical suffering is the theme. Here the deepest emotions of the soul are disclosed. Far more nearly allied is the group to that of the Niobe. The grief of the mother for the loss of her children is similar to the grief of the warrior for the death of his youthful friend. The theme of each representation is grief at untimely death; and in each the idea is fully expressed without exhibition of inartistic or false pathos. Again: the noble forms of Menelaus, especially as they appear in the Pasquino where the marble seems alive with pulsating and breathing life, can only have been produced during the highest period of art. In fashion and sentiment the group may well be of the school which produced the Niobe and the sculpture of the Mausoleum.¹

THE LUDOVISI JUNO.

57. A marble head in the Villa Ludovisi in Rome. The point of the nose has been restored.

Winckelmann prized this head as the most beautiful of all representations of Juno. It has already been mentioned in the description of the Farnese bust of Juno in the Naples Museum. The main difference between the two is that while the Naples bust represents pure and unmixed divinity, here the human and the divine are most wonderfully blended. When the Naples bust was executed reverence for the gods was severe and exalted. To the artist of the Ludovisi bust human beauty appealed as strongly as the divine. The one excels in religious expression, the other in artistic beauty; the two worthily represent the art and the religion of different periods. How far apart in point of time the two are to be placed

¹ Burckhardt names the group Ajax with the body of Achilles, and the more recent writers are inclined to accept his judgment. During this very conflict Hector is reproached for dreading Menelaus, as up to this time he had been a timid fighter "*μαλζωκός αιχμητής*." (Il. xvii, 588.) At the time the group was executed Menelaus was as ridiculous a character as he is to-day ("*'ri de la Reine*"), and could hardly have been selected for the hero of noble tragedy.

cannot be determined. As the Juno of Polycleitus is assigned to the last decades of the fifth century, and as the style of the Farnese Juno indicates a still earlier origin, the Ludovisi Juno must at least be assigned to the fourth century.

The Ludovisi head is not the old type remodelled to suit a later period, but it is an original and independent creation. The name of the artist is unknown, but he may safely be presumed to have been an Athenian; for the large fine forms seen in this head are peculiarly Attic.

Schiller's description of the statue is celebrated.¹ "It is neither grace nor dignity that speaks to us from the head of the Ludovisi Juno. It is neither the one nor the other, because it is both. While the womanly god compels our worship, the divine woman kindles our love. While we surrender ourselves unconditionally to the heavenly sweetness, the divine self-sufficiently repels. A thoroughly complete creation, her whole being rests and moves within itself as if her abode were beyond the region of limitations; where there are no contentions of forces, no obstacles, no opposition, no openings through which temporalities can force admission."

CERES OF CNIDUS.

58. [A seated statue discovered amid the ruins of Cnidus in March 1858 by an English expedition in charge of Mr. C. T. Newton; at present with the statues from the Mausoleum in the British Museum.

The head was found apart from the statue and is apparently of a different and finer marble. The end of the nose has been broken off. The statue itself has lost feet and arms and is much damaged. The head is of great beauty and is assigned to the best period of Greek sculpture. The resemblance of the dimensions of the face to

¹ "Ueber die Aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen Geschlechts." B. xv.

that of the face of a triton in the Vatican,¹ attributed to Scopas, suggests that the work may be from the school of that artist. A peculiarity of these dimensions is the shortness of the line connecting the eyes in comparison with the length of the whole face.

The object of the artist was not to represent the divine Ceres; but Ceres the mother, who after long and painful separation has at last been restored to a partial enjoyment of her daughter's society. The evidences of prolonged suffering are the hollows at the outer corners of the eyes, the eyebrows still drawn together and upwards, the mouth hardly yet daring to smile, and the intense longing of the eyes which are not yet fully assured that the long day of separation is over. The face is so human and so modern in its expression of disinterested maternal affection that it seems as if it ought to be assigned to a Christian period. There is, moreover, such an absence of the grandeur and dignity associated with the character of Ceres as to throw further doubts upon the propriety of assigning the work to the period of Scopas and Praxiteles. As a study of expression nothing equal to it has been rescued from classic art, nothing superior to it has been produced by modern art. Heinrich Brunn² has made a very careful, minute and interesting analysis of the expression in which he draws fully out the nature of the resemblance to the triton of the Vatican. A translation of Brunn's paper is in the *Trans. of the Royal Society of Literature*, vol. xi. — *Ed.*]

WEDDING OF NEPTUNE AND AMPHITRITE.

(From Heinrich Brunn's Catalogue of the Munich Glyptothek.)

59. A relief in Parian marble. Length 8.88 m. Height 0.79 m. Formerly in the Santo Croce Palace at Rome.

¹ Visconti, Museo Pio Clementino I., 34.

² *Vorhandlungen der Neunundzwanzigsten Versammlung Deutscher Philologen and Schulmänner in Innsbruck*, 1874.

The relief has been very extensively repaired, but as the background was intact and only the salient parts of the figures injured, the restorer's work was not difficult.

The scene represents the wedding procession of Neptune and Amphitrite. The pair are seated in a two-wheeled chariot which has a high, straight, draped, back. The chariot is directed to the left, and is slightly turned so as to partially face the spectator. Neptune has full beard and flowing hair. About his brow is a royal fillet. About his loins is thrown a mantle. He holds the reins with his right hand; in his left was probably a metallic trident. On his right is Amphitrite covered with the nuptial veil which, with her left hand, she seems modestly to be gathering still more closely about her face. The chariot is drawn by two youthful tritons about whose bodies pass the reins. One blows a conch-shell, — to which the nuptial flute here appropriately gives place, — the other touches the strings of a lyre. Meeting the procession is a matronly nereid who, seated sidewise on a sea-horse, clothed with a rich double garment, and bearing on her head the matronly kerchief, holds out towards the married pair two flaming torches. This figure is probably Doris, the daughter of Oceanus and the mother of Amphitrite. Upon each side of this double central group are other groups and figures. Upon the immediate left is a marine bull, guided by a little Cupid who sits on the tail of the marine horse which carries Doris. On the bull's back is a female figure clad in a light tunic with a mantle gathered about her hips. Her face is turned towards the centre of the composition, but her person is turned away from it. In both hands she holds a jewel casket. Then follow two other female figures; one seated on the back of a young triton, who is furnished with fore legs like the legs of a marine horse; the other seated on a sea-dragon, driven by the triton. The figure partially hidden from the spectator is apparently holding in her hands a large object.¹ The other figure with her back

¹ This part of the relief is indistinct. Brunn refers to the left arm

to the spectator is either nude or most delicately draped. She is girt beneath the breasts by a band, and a mantle is gathered about her hips. Her left arm and her head are turned towards the centre of the composition.

On the other side of Neptune's chariot is a nereid upon the back of a sea-horse. She is seated amid the convolutions of his tail in such a way that her back is turned to the spectator, her face towards the centre of the composition, and her feet away from it. She is lightly clad, wears the breast girdle, and has a mantle wrapped about her hips. In her left hand she holds out a dish towards the married pair.¹ A little Cupid standing upon the upraised pawing leg of the horse holds the bridle. Another Cupid, seated upon a curl of the monster's tail, gazes about with serene content. Then follows a group which consists of two female figures seated on a sea-dragon and a bearded triton so placed in front of them as to nearly hide the figure which is nearer the centre. It can be seen that her face turns to the centre of the composition, but neither the attitude nor the action can be made out. The other one, delicately draped, with breast girdle, and with mantled hips, holds in her left hand a large leaf-shaped fan, and in her lap an object which is too indistinct for identification. She turns her head away from the centre.² The bridle is held by a little Cupid who flies in front of the dragon.

In a marine composition of this character the general term Nereid is applicable to the female figures; but the fact that there are here three on each side and that the articles they hold, judging from the jewel caskets, may

of the triton. I could neither make it out nor the object held by the female figure, nor could I satisfy myself that the figure was holding anything at all, or had arms to hold with.

¹ It seemed to me that she held some object in her two hands; a horn of marine plenty, for instance.

² This part of the relief is quite indistinct. The heads and part of the right arms of the female figures and the head of the triton, are modern. The action was evidently not sufficiently preserved to be a certain guide in restoring.

be for the toilet and for decoration, permit the supposition that these figures are, or represent, the double triad of the Hours and the Graces, those divinities who in Olympus attend on the nuptials of the gods. This notion gives the composition artistic finish and completes its affinity to the famous Aldobrandini fresco; only that while in the fresco the scene takes place in the nuptial chamber here an earlier episode is represented, the solemn procession by which the bride is conducted to the dwelling of the bridegroom.¹

It seems odd that in such a composition there should be absolutely nothing to indicate the only element in which sea divinities can have their being. Not only is there no evidence of water, but the outer groups are separated from the rest of the composition by pure architectural members. These architectural divisions can only be explained on the supposition that the relief was originally executed as a part of an architectural whole. It may have been made to correspond to the six columnæ, or to other subdivisions of a temple; the central double group occupying two of such divisions corresponding with the door-way of a cella.²

The composition itself seems to indicate some such position; for while the various groups move towards a common centre, they are most skilfully made to appear as if they were uniting and advancing to the front. The lines of the back of the chariot; the oval shape given to

¹ The scene is more likely post-nuptial; though the exact time was immaterial to the artist whose intention was to give an artistic rendering of the whole event. Brunn must not be understood as stating that the Hours and the Graces appear in the Aldobrandini fresco.

² Brunn supposes that the frieze ornamented the front of a cella. In that case, according to his dividing, the outer division on either side would have spanned the peristyle — an unheard-of arrangement. Besides, as the frieze is but about twenty feet long his arrangement requires a hexastyle temple of but that width — an unheard-of temple. It may be that the Munich slabs do not contain the entire composition. In the group on the extreme right, one of the female figures looks away from the centre as if another part of the procession had attracted her attention. Besides, the end groups are not of the same length by several inches.

the wheel, as if it were seen in perspective; the position of the tritons, one turned well to the front and the other coming up around him, all unite in making the change of direction very evident. In a lesser degree the same action can be seen in the sea-horse ridden by Doris. He turns his head to the front while the folds of his tail recede. It is evident that there will be no clashing; the groups will advance side by side. This effect is further increased by the character of the execution. It is more careful in the centre, the parts supposed to be nearer to the spectator; and more sketchy at the ends, the parts supposed to be at a greater distance. The execution is all large because a position within the portico of a temple required it; the light being necessarily insufficient for the perception and appreciation of details. Still the difference between the technique of the centre and that of the ends is very perceptible. The eye of the spectator is naturally attracted to the more finished centre. The centre seems actually advancing towards him; while the ends, which are hardly more than blocked out, lose themselves in the distance. The broad and easy character of the execution makes the rich fantasy of the conception all the more conspicuous. The fundamental idea of the composition is simple; to its simplicity is given, however, a marvellous richness of lines by the sea-monsters. They, in their turn, are restrained from wildness and subdued from inspiring terror by the graceful female figures which, as, if by accident, but in fact by most marvellous skill, are placed where their gentle subduing power is the most strongly felt. The monsters become so kind and tractable that little love-gods may lead them with slackened rein. The danger, on the other hand, that the subduing of such monsters of the deep might appear weak and unworthy is avoided by the introduction of the architectural members, which give the whole composition strength and well ordered vigor. The character of deep melancholy, or of intractable passion so frequently given by ancient art to the denizens of the ocean would, of

course, not be made conspicuous in a marriage procession. Still the figure of Neptune is not untrue to tradition. The breast is broad and massive, the hair is heavy as with moisture, the head is slightly bent, and is not free from a disturbed expression suggestive of the possibility of outbreaks of wild passion. The Tritons, too, in the midst of their fresh sprightliness and youthful loveliness are not free from an expression of easily excited irritability. Still, the whole composition is filled with fresh and vigorous life. There is no affectation; no striving for sensual effects. The work from every point of view shows excellences which permit it to be regarded as of Greek conception and of Greek execution. The conception points to a period when creative power was still undiminished. The execution displays the fullest mastery of the means of representation and the most perfect subordination of the technique to higher objects; to architectural relations, and to the ideal significance of the subject.

The subject recalls the art tendency of Scopas. One of his chief works, "Neptune, Thetis, Achilles, Nereids, Sea-monsters, etc.," probably from Asia Minor, stood in Rome in the temple of Domitius not far from the Circus Flaminius.¹ In the same part of the city is the Palace of Santa Croce where the Munich relief formerly belonged. The supposition is plausible that the two may have been found together. At all events Ulrichs'² notion may be entertained that if this frieze be not by Scopas, it is related to him as the frieze of the cella of the Parthenon is to Phidias.

THE VATICAN TRITON.³

60. Five and a quarter palms high; without the base, four and a half; found by Giuseppe Buti at S. Angelo in the Tiburtino.

¹ Plin., xxxvi, 4.

² Scopas' *Leben und Werke*, von Ludwig Ulrichs.

³ This is the statue between which and the Ceres of Cnidus, Brunn traces so many resemblances. If this Triton formed part of the fa-

The grand style of this extraordinary torso makes it one of the most beautiful and one of the most precious of all representations of marine divinities. The character of the fish-man and that of his monstrous nature are so well expressed in his lineaments that there is no room for mistake though only the human parts are extant. His features, though mannered, are filled with an ideal beauty and a nobility which make them becoming to a god though we must refer them to a monster. The mouth, partly open, has an expression that is hardly human; yet the lines cannot have been derived from the study of any denizen of the ocean. The scaly skin, tied under the throat, recalls the hide worn by Hercules or by the inebriate followers of Bacchus. The faun's ears relate to Bacchus, or they may have been added in order that at the first glance a monster could be recognized. All the rest of the body is executed with a marvellous freshness. A thought occurs to me. The great Buonarrotti seems, at times, to have imitated those artists of antiquity who in their works blended the human with the animal. His object was not the same as theirs, but he seems to have discovered a certain subtle beauty in such combinations, and to have been led to its enjoyment by the taste for the wild and the fierce which he so frequently displays.¹

THE VIENNA JUNO TORSO.

61. A marble statue found forty odd years ago amid the ruins of Ephesus, now in the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna.

mous work by Scopas, then these resemblances offer an argument that the Ceres was also by Scopas. Brunn's article is too long to be given. It is very suggestive and interesting. The description of the Triton is taken from the Museo Pio Clementino (I, 84) of Visconti. The statue is but a torso; the parts from the waist down are wanting, also the forearms.

¹ Visconti's descriptions, though not erudite and sometimes erroneous, are full of joyous appreciation. He brought to bear upon his subject a fair share of the learning of his times, and approached it with enthusiastic affection. The works of German writers must be studied and must be kept as guides; but it is often a relief to turn away from them to Visconti's simple and imaginative recitals.

This statue is the most beautiful of all those statues of Juno which are derived from a certain fixed type. The type is recognized by the imposingly outstretched right hand holding a sceptre, while a dish may be supposed to be in the left hand. In repetitions which are better preserved and have the head a crown identifies the statue as that of Juno.

There can be no doubt that this is a work of the best period of Greek art. The nude of the breast is handled as in the best periods, so also the sharp folds of the linen undergarment. One peculiarity, however, of this undergarment prevents a reference to a very early period. In places it adheres very closely to the nude, so that the nude is visible through it. This excessive refinement of handling first appears on the frieze of the Erechtheum, though even there it is exceptional. In representations of Venus and of Bacchantes this peculiarity occurs, and sometimes also in small statues of Minerva.¹

JUPITER OF OTRICOLI.

62. A marble head found at Otricoli² during the excavations undertaken by Pope Pius VI (1775-1799).

The mask is the only part that is ancient; and of that

¹ In Overbeck's *Kunstmythologie*, iii, 112, there is further discussion of some of the points contained in Friederichs' description. Overbeck claims that there are only two statues in existence that resemble the Vienna torso so nearly as to be referable to the same type. These are: 1st, a statue in the Naples Museum known as the Farnese Juno; and, 2d, a statue in the Vatican known as the Otricoli Juno. As the heads of these statues are not original there is no absolute certainty that the type is a Juno type; nor is there any foundation for the supposition that the head of the Vienna torso wore a crown.

One striking peculiarity of the drapery of the three statues is the hanging of the drapery from one breast to the other in a species of festoon; a motive neither natural, refined, nor comfortable. I should hesitate to assign this statue to the best art-periods though appreciating the masterly management of the folds of the himation, or outer garment.

² A small town about fifty miles north of Rome, built near the site of the ancient Otriculum.

the tip of the nose is modern, also some small parts of the hair.

Winckelmann regretted that modern artists, instead of representing the Almighty as aged, had not followed the example of the Greeks, who present their Zeus in the beauty of fully developed manhood.

It is more in accordance with Christianity, however, to represent the Almighty in the fulness of years; for in this way the idea of the "Father" is made more emphatic, and spirituality is made more impressive.

The Greeks always represented divinity in the perfection of physical beauty. There is no old age in Olympus.

This bust is the most beautiful of all representations of Jupiter. The high forehead is made to appear still higher by the lines of the hair which meet in the centre in a somewhat sharply pointed arch. When the arch of the hair is round a more attractive expression is obtained, but this pointed arch increases dignity by its verticality.

The upper part of the brow, regarded as the seat of thought, is as strongly developed as the lower and more prominent part where strength and energy are expressed. In this respect the brow is in strong contrast to that of Hercules for instance, where only the lower part of the brow is fully developed. An appearance of still greater elevation is given to the forehead by the manner in which the hair rises like a mane and then falls on either side in waves. The hair has, however, none of the wet and lifeless appearance given to the hair of marine divinities, where it falls with straighter lines and partially conceals the face.

A deep furrow divides the hair from the face. This furrow imparts liveliness and makes the rich masses of the hair conspicuous.

The beard is curled, and though not so tightly curled as the beard of Hercules, it still makes a rich contrast to the waving masses of the hair. The beard is moreover divided into symmetrical masses that seem admirably

in keeping with Olympian dignity. The beard of Hercules with its undivided rows of curls, or the disordered beard of Neptune, would ill become Jupiter; especially when, as here, he is conceived as enthroned in majesty. Nor should the serenity of the king of the gods be marred by the furrows which appear on the cheeks of the passionate god of the sea.

When discovered this head was accepted as a copy of the Olympian Jupiter of Phidias. Increased knowledge has shown the error of this supposition.

Two coins of the time of Hadrian have been found at Elis, each bearing what is in all probability a representation of the Jupiter of Phidias. On the one preserved in Paris is only a head; the other, in Florence, gives an entire statue. These coins show a face of far greater severity than the Otricoli mask; one, too, in which there are lingering traces of the archaic. In fact, all heads that can be assigned to the Phidian period are severe in character, and show an unnatural and typical expression.

The luxuriant hair and the lively expression of the Otricoli mask place it at least a hundred years after Phidias. Such free treatment of the hair would have been as much out of keeping with the sculpture of the time of Phidias as realistic ornamentation would have been out of keeping with the architecture of the same period.

As the head is of Carrara marble the execution is Roman, probably of the first century.

THE MARS OF THE VILLA LUDOVISI.

63. The god is represented seated. His left knee is elevated and clasped by his hands. The left hand also holds the hilt of a sword. A young Cupid is seated by his right foot. Near by is a helmet, and to the right a shield. The right hand and the right foot of Mars are modern, also the sword-hilt. The head, left arm, half of

the right arm, and the right foot, of the Cupid, are also restorations ; so also the top part of the quiver.

A projection on the left shoulder of Mars and another one lower down on the same side are probably indications of supports and show that a third figure belonged to the group. This third figure can hardly have been any other than Venus. The presence of Venus seems more-over necessitated by the situation. Mars, sword in hand and ready for the combat, has been persuaded to stop and is still lingering. The little Cupid at his feet, hidden away so that the god does not see him, would not of himself sufficiently explain the motive. Nor would the addition of a second Cupid as a third figure suffice. That goddess herself must have been present with whom Mars was so intimately united in both art and tradition. The god turns his head slightly to the right and away from her persuasions, but the action is slight and the opposition weak. Mars has already been untrue to his own nature. He has seated himself and has assumed an attitude of such comfortable repose that all idea of the warrior is gone.

The clasped knee recalls one of the figures of gods on the east end of the frieze of the cella of the Parthenon ; but the resemblance between the two figures is slight, and the similarity of action does not necessarily indicate imitation.

In style the work shows a great resemblance to the *Apoxyomenos* of Lysippus. The heads of the two statues are strikingly alike. In form and expression and in the treatment of the hair resemblances are so marked that the school that produced the one must have produced the other. The character of the whole work indicates a late period, as from the point of view of early art the figure is neither dignified nor godlike.

The grand conception and masterly execution, however, combine to stamp it as an original and an original of the greatest excellence.¹

¹ This statue is one of the most excellent works of ancient art. The

NAPLES TORSO OF BACCHUS.

64. A headless, armless, and legless, torso; now in the Naples museum, formerly in the Farnese collection in Rome. The god is represented seated and slightly turned to the right.

Bacchus is recognized in the general form of the body, in the gentle waves of the loosened locks, and in the indications on the back of the neck that the head was bound with a fillet. The turning to the right of head, right arm, and body, seems to indicate that a second figure stood by the side of the god. The torso has been polished to such an extent as to destroy the original surface. The elastic flesh and the gently swelling forms of this torso proclaim it to be an original and the work of a master. The expression is womanly but not weak.

Poussin is said to have formed his style on a study of this statue.¹

Meyer, a friend of Goethe, and a most experienced critic of classic art, praises the torso especially for the noble union it presents of the great with the beautiful and the gentle. Meyer refers the statue to the best period; that is, to the fourth century B.C. The treatment of the flesh would indicate a later period. Perhaps the torso may be an example of that excellency in rendering the elasticity of flesh for which the school of Praxiteles was celebrated. The grand forms to which

lines are so harmoniously beautiful from every point of view that a third figure can hardly have been present to hide them. If Venus were with him Mars would not have so far away and so dreamlike an expression.

The projection on the shoulder may indicate that another Cupid, and perhaps one on the wing, was present. Attitude and expression are not those of a warrior restrained from fight. They are rather those of one who has had enough of fighting, who is tired of it and who is beginning to find greater content in rest and in dreams of love.

¹ Nicolas Poussin, born in Normandy in 1594, died in Rome in 1665. One of the most eminent French painters of the seventeenth century. Though a severe and faithful student of classic art he was thoroughly original and Gallic.

Meyer calls attention could not have been produced during a later and less artistic period.¹

THE SO-CALLED BELVEDERE ANTINOUS.

65. Found in Rome in the neighborhood of the church of St. Martino a' Monti,² secured for the Vatican by Leo X or Paul III and at present in the Belvedere.

The right leg was broken at the ankle and also just below the hip. The pieces have not been accurately joined; the ankle appears out of shape. The figure is erect and stands by the side of the trunk of a palm-tree. The only garment is a chlamys. One end of it hangs in front over the left shoulder while the other end is wrapped about the left forearm. The right arm and the left hand are wanting.

There are indications on the left hip of the fingers of the left hand; and there are indications on the left leg of the falling chlamys.

Numerous repetitions of this figure, some of which are better preserved, show that the chlamys fell against the left leg, that the left hand rested against the hip, that in the right hand was the caduceus, and that the figure is Mercury and not Antinous. The figure has, however, been so long known as Antinous that the name will probably adhere.

The slight and agile messenger of the gods is not here shown, but the hardy god of the palæstra resting from his victories. The palm trunk so often used without meaning, simply to vary the appearance of the support, must

¹ Heinrich Meyer; (1759-1832) member of an artistic Swiss family living in Zurich, sometimes called Goethe-Meyer on account of his intimacy with the poet whom he assisted in those of his writings which relate to the fine arts; author of a history of Greek Sculpture; well known as an annotator of Winckelmann, from whose views he did not depart though he lived long enough to be able to study the Elgin marbles.

² On the Esquiline, not very far from the ruins of the baths of Titus.

here have special significance, indicating that the god is not only a victorious god but the god of victories. For the palm-leaf quite as much as the crown was the symbol of victory. Indeed the crown was sometimes itself of palms.

The manner in which the chlamys is wrapped about the left arm is very characteristic of the god; for so arranged it offers no obstacle to free movement.

The work is not an original, but a copy of a Greek statue of great excellence. Some critics refer it to the time of Phidias, but at that time Mercury and athletes were represented with very short hair lying close to the head. Nor is there any of the severity of the Phidian period observable. E. Braun refers the work to the time of Polycleitus. The general form of the statue is more suggestive of Lysippus.

That the statue is a copy is inferred from the very high polish. The same injurious polish appears on the Apollo Belvedere. Such polishing was never practised during the best art-periods.¹

An oddity of this statue is that the circular glandular portion of the nipple is represented by an indentation.

THE MELEAGER OF THE BELVEDERE.

(From Emil Braun's "Die Ruinen und Museen Roms.")

66. The reputation of a work of art does not always depend upon the excellence of the execution, but frequently upon the inner and more spiritual impression it produces. And this impression once made will abide in spite of the carpings of criticism. The statue of Meleager is a capital example in point; for in spite of the execution it has attracted the highest attention ever

¹ Many ancient statues have been injured by subsequent polishing, as the Naples torso of Bacchus for instance; but in the case of the statue under consideration and of the Apollo it is supposed that the polishing was done at the time the statues were executed.

since there existed a taste for classic art. Raphael and Michael Angelo were filled with admiration when beholding it. Michael Angelo, it is said, refused to undertake the restoration of the left hand, saying that the art that begat the statue was too far superior to his own. Whatever may be the truth of this tradition, the fact that the statue is still unrestored shows that none of the great sculptors of the 15th century, when restoring was so rife, presumed to expose the statue to the dangers of the operation. Their successors have displayed equal hesitancy, though it is evident that the restoration of the hand would enforce the composition; for the hand undoubtedly held a spear, and the spear held by the hand was the central motive of the composition. The slight bending of the body and the slight elevation of the left shoulder show that the youth was resting gently and gracefully upon his spear. The peculiar quick glance he seems giving about him indicates the energetic hunter, and the large and disordered folds of the chlamys wrapped about his left arm seem in keeping with the impetuosity which led the Calydonian conqueror to his destruction.

Fine representation of character is the special excellence of this statue. In it is a true account of every trait of the hero whose history is in Homer unfolded to the angry Achilles for instruction and warning.

The unparalleled virtues of the son of Althæa are shown side by side with his morbid passion. So intimately are they blended in the representation that no separation seems possible. Heroic self-sacrifice and insatiate selfishness, impulsiveness and cold reserve, affectionate devotion and uncontrollable anger, are here united and expressed in one and the same glance. These opposing sentiments seem as if balanced in equipoise, needing but an atom's weight on one side or the other to turn the scale and excite impulsive action. It seems as if chance might any moment intervene. The deeper the character of the hero as shown in this statue is

studied, the clearer appears the significance of the myth of the union of his life with the life of a half-burned ember. As fire would consume the log, so the flames of passion will consume the hero. With inimitable compactness all this is expressed in the face; here, too, the beauty of the statue reaches its highest point. Few heads of the hero type can be compared to this head for power of expression. Of the rest of the statue the execution is so careless that the only possible conclusion is that the work was left unfinished.¹

THE APOLLO MUSAGETES OF THE VATICAN.

67. [A marble statue found in 1774 in the ruins of the so-called Villa of Cassius, added to the Vatican collection by Pius VI (1775-1799). The right hand and forearm, the left hand and wrist, the points of nose and chin, parts of the feet, and the greater part of the lyre, are restorations.]

The god is clothed in a garment which reaches to the feet and which is bound under the breast with a girdle. Fastened to the shoulders is an equally long mantle which covers the back with its rich folds. The heavy lyre, upon which the god accompanies his song, is supported by a brazen ring through which a band passes over the left shoulder. Crowned with laurel, the divin-

¹ The statue is probably a Roman copy in marble of some celebrated Greek bronze original. In the original the boar's head which here serves partially as a support did not exist, nor the dog at the hero's right side. The figure balanced itself on the spear, and the dog was unnecessary for explanation.

The resemblance in pose and in the arrangement of the chlamys to the Mercury of the Belvedere already described is striking but not sufficient to justify referring the statues to the same school. As Scopas, according to Pausanias (VIII, 45, 1), had charge of the sculpture of the temple of the winged Minerva at Tegea in Arcadia, and as in one of the pediments of the temple the Calcydonian hunt was represented, it may be that the Meleager type of which the Vatican statue is the best extant representative is referable to the school of which Scopas was founder and chief.

ity is represented as moving forward in the dance in which he leads the muses (Μοῦσα ἡγέσθαι).

The statue is of inferior execution, but noble and impressive in motive and action. It is evidently a copy of some famous original. By some critics it is accepted as a reduced copy of the colossal statue of Apollo by Scopas brought by Augustus to Rome from Rhamnus and placed by him on the temple he erected to Apollo on the Palatine to celebrate the victory of Actium.

Pliny states that the Palatine Apollo was by Scopas (N.H. XXXVI, 4), and Propertius (II, 31) in his description of the temple on the Palatine speaks of Apollo as singing in a long garment: "In longa carmina veste sonat."

There are moreover coins of the time of Nero on which is engraved an Apollo substantially the same as this statue. On the other hand, coins of the time of Augustus bearing an Apollo do not suggest this statue; nor are the images on the coins all alike. The question is still an open one. Of later writers Overbeck does not accept the Scopas theory (G. der G. P. II, 20), Burckhardt apparently does (Der Cicerone, 3te Auflage; 477 d.). Until the style of the school of Scopas has been defined by the discovery of authentic works there can be no internal evidence to assist the inquirer. There are other statues of Apollo where drapery and action are about the same as they are here, but this one is by far the most excellent and the most suggestive of the merit of the original.

With the Apollo were found statues of the Muses. If Scopas executed the original of the Apollo he may also have been the artist of the originals from which these statues of Muses were copied. Certain resemblances in technique and in expression between these statues and some of the Niobe statues cannot fail to attract attention. Scopas may have chosen one subject to illustrate the pathetic and the tragic; the other, a companion piece, to

illustrate the pensive and the peaceful; the two groups ornamenting the two pediments of a temple.

This he may have done in imitation of Praxias, a contemporary of Phidias, who according to Pausanias (X, 19, 4) ornamented the pediments of the temple of Apollo at Delphi. At one end he placed Latona, Apollo, Diana, and the Muses; at the other, the setting sun, Bacchus and the Thyades; the latter in their bacchanalian action forming a contrast to the quiet befitting the group of the Muses. The number of the Muses was fixed by Hesiod at nine and were placed by him in the following order: Clio, Euterpe, Thalia, Melpomene, Terpsichore, Erato, Polyhymnia, Urania, and Calliope. This order will be observed in the description of the statues in the Vatican.

CLIO, THE MUSE OF HISTORY (κλέος) — fame).

68. Seated on rocky Parnassus she turns the scroll upon which are inscribed the names and deeds of heroes. She is clothed in a long garment bound beneath the breasts and reaching to her feet. It has buttoned sleeves that reach to the elbows. In addition, a large mantle is folded across her knees and falls to the ground on the left. The scroll which lies on her lap is held by the left hand. The right hand is slightly raised to indicate or to call attention.

The head is antique, but not the original head. The forearms, hands, part of the scroll, and the left knee, are restorations. The workmanship is inferior, the conception most graceful. Clio is almost always represented with a roll and generally the roll is in the left hand. She is quite as often represented erect as seated.

EUTERPE.

The muse of lyric poetry is generally represented with one or two flutes or pipes. In the Vatican statue she is

seated on a rock with her legs somewhat extended. She is clothed with a sleeveless garment girt under the breasts and held by a brooch. About her loins is a mantle. Her right hand rests on the rock; her left holds a flute or pipe. The head is antique, but did not originally belong to the statue. The forearms and one of the feet are modern. This statue was found at Otricoli and was added to the group found at the Villa of Cassius to complete the number.

Repetitions of the statue attest the celebrity of the original. The pose and attitude are most graceful. In no statue of antiquity is the pure, gentle, modest, and delicate conception of the Muses more clearly expressed. The execution is better than that of the others; though it is very evident that the statue is a copy.

THALIA.

The muse of comedy is generally represented with a mask, to which is frequently added the pedum or shepherd's crook. Here in addition the muse has a tambourine. The right forearm and part of the pedum are modern, also a part of the left arm and a part of the tambourine. There are other smaller restorations. The head is the original head, but has been broken off and replaced. The ivy crown and the seated posture are exceptional. The drapery is over-abundant. The face has an expression of sadness that seems out of keeping with the character of the muse. Many other statues of Thalia have this same expression, indicating, perhaps, that mirth is disappointing.¹

MELOPOMENE.

The muse of tragedy is represented standing, her left leg raised, the foot resting on a rock. In her right hand

¹ Of the many statues of Thalia in the collections of Europe, I can recall no other one that is seated.

she holds a mask of Hercules ; in her left, a dagger. The left elbow rests on the left knee. She is clothed in a long-sleeved chiton which is double as far down as the hips. A mantle is thrown about the right arm and over the left shoulder. The right hand and the upper part of the mask are restorations, also the left hand and the dagger. The hair is long and abundant. The head is crowned with a Bacchic wreath. The position is odd and ungraceful, though conveying an idea of rest after masculine exertion. A very similar statue is in the Royal Museum at Stockholm. The Stockholm statue is far finer, and gives a good idea of the strength and power of the original from which the two are copied.¹

TERPSICHORE.

The muse of choral dance and song is represented in the Vatican statue seated on a rock, holding the lyre with her left hand and touching the strings with the right. The chiton has buttoned sleeves reaching to the elbows. The mantle, fastened to the shoulders by large buttons, is arranged over the lap and falls on the left side. The head, the forearms, the horns of the lyre, the left foot, and the end of the left knee, are restorations. The head is antique, but is not the original head. Terpsichore like this is quite as frequently represented erect as seated.

ERATO.

The muse of erotic poetry is hardly to be distinguished from Terpsichore. They each play the lyre. They are each represented both seated and erect. In dress and attitude there are further resemblances.

The Erato of the Vatican is a noble figure and must be a copy from a celebrated antique. Standing erect, with the lyre supported on the left side, she touches its strings with

¹ Of all the extant representations of Melpomene the most impressive is the colossal of the Louvre, which will be described hereafter.

the right, while the left foot moves from the ground as if the figure were about commencing a solemn nuptial dance. The drapery resembles that of the other Muses but is simpler and better ordered, hanging in large folds after the manner of the best periods. The head is antique, but is probably not the original head. It is interesting on account of its resemblance to heads of Sappho found on coins of the island of Lesbos.¹

POLYHYMNIA, THE MUSE OF THE SUBLIME HYMN.

Polyhymnia is distinguished from the other Muses by her meditative attitude and by the large mantle which is often folded about her so as to conceal both hands. The Vatican possesses several statues of this Muse. The one found in the Villa of Cassius is erect. Both arms and the left hand are hidden beneath the mantle. The right hand, held in front of, and partially emerging from, the drapery, holds an object which may be a scroll. In a more celebrated type, of which the Vatican possesses at least one example, the Muse supports her chin with her right hand, the right elbow resting on a rock or a pedestal; while the left arm, also resting on the rock, passes across the body, the left hand hanging down between the body and the right elbow. The drapery is generally so arranged as to entirely cover the right hand and arm and the left arm. The figure generally rests on the left foot; the right foot only touching the ground with the toes. Sometimes the feet are crossed. The attitude is one of great difficulty,

¹ Standing near this statue is another statue named Erato, which has been the object of much discussion. On account of the great resemblance of its drapery to the drapery of Apollo on the coins of Augustus, some writers maintain that this statue is not a Muse but an Apollo, and a nearer copy of the Apollo by Scopas than the Apollo Musagetes already described. The figure is certainly masculine; for it has neither the breasts nor the hips of a woman. As the right arm is a restoration, the right hand may well have held the patera, and thus have made the resemblance to some of the Augustine coins still nearer. The statue is of poor workmanship, and is of no assistance in forming an opinion of Scopas' style.

and seems to have been selected to give the artist an opportunity of displaying his skill in the management of drapery. Famous examples of the type are in Paris and Berlin. The French statue is especially celebrated for the excellency of the restored portions; the work of a Roman sculptor, Agostino Penna, the reputed master of Canova.

URANIA, THE MUSE OF ASTRONOMY.

Urania is represented with a globe in one hand and a rod for pointing in the other. There are so many representations of this Muse and so many differences between them that no leading type can be established. The Vatican statue found at Tivoli with the statues of the other Muses represents Urania seated, holding a globe in the left hand and the pointing-rod in the right. The sleeveless chiton is quite loose about the neck. It has fallen so as to leave the left shoulder and part of the left breast bare. The hair is very singularly ornamented with upright feathers, as if the Muse were an Indian princess. The conception is more odd than attractive, and can by no possibility be assigned to an art-period of high development.

The execution of the statue is careful and finished, more so than any other of the group.¹

CALLIOPE.

Calliope, the Muse of Epic Poetry and supposed to be the eldest of the sisters, is represented in art either seated or standing with the stylus in one hand and the waxen tablets in the other. Of all the statues of Calliope the one found in the Villa of Cassius is by far the most graceful and the most artistically excellent. The fore-

¹ A far finer type is the upright Urania, of which the museums of Europe contain so many specimens that their description and classification would be a work by itself; nor are any of them of such excellence as to justify their study from an artistic point of view.

arms are restored but there can be no doubt of the correctness of the restoration. Seated on Mt. Parnassus, her figure slightly bent in meditation, she holds the tablets in her left hand; while the right, holding the stylus, is poised in a manner to enhance the expression of thought. Perhaps the exact word has not yet been found which will give full expression to the idea without violating the metre; perhaps the stylus is about to be turned, that its flattened upper end may erase a defective foot and make the wax smooth for the emendation. There are few works of art in which the artist's conception is more clearly and admirably expressed. This statue and the Euterpe of the same collection are worthy to be assigned to the best period of Greek sculpture.¹ — *Ed.*]

RELIEFS OF THE MAUSOLEUM.²

69. [The Mausoleum of Halicarnassus is supposed to have remained substantially in its original condition down to the 12th century, when it was destroyed by an earthquake. In 1402 the Knights of St. John took possession of the peninsula of Halicarnassus and fortified themselves by the erection of a castle, using as building material the ruins of the Mausoleum. In 1646 Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, English ambassador to Constantinople, found built into the walls of this castle a number of bass-reliefs. These he secured and they are now in the British Museum.

The excavations superintended by Mr. C. T. Newton

¹ The statues of the Muses above cited, and numerous others, have not as yet been sufficiently studied and described. Clarac briefly mentions a number, and Visconti, with artistic fervor and with delightfully defective erudition, describes the individual statues of the Roman collections. German writers, so far, have hardly given these statues any attention. It may be reserved to a scholar who has the fervor of a Visconti united to the logical and patient profundity of an Overbeck to establish their genesis.

² Mausolus, King of Caria, died in 352 B.C. His wife and sister, Artemisia, succeeded him, and for two years consumed away in grief

in 1856-7 not only disclosed the site of the tomb but resulted in the securing of many valuable fragments. From some of these two colossal statues have been reconstructed which are supposed to represent Mausolus and Artemisia. Fragments were found of the four-horse chariot, of the horses attached to it, and of many figures male and female. Of still greater interest was the discovery of bas-reliefs that proved by correspondence the genuineness of those secured by Viscount de Redcliffe. Pliny in his description of the Mausoleum states that Scopas and three other sculptors were employed in its decoration. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the friezes attached to the building were designed by Scopas or by artists who were thought worthy to be associated with him, and who with him were representatives of the art-development of the period. All these marbles are in the British Museum, together with a slab in four pieces found in Genoa where it had probably been sent by the Knights of St. John. The most important of these marbles is the statue already mentioned which has been named Mausolus. It was put together from 65 fragments. The arms are wanting, also the left foot, part of the hair, and other smaller and less

for the loss of her lord. She is said to have mingled his ashes with her food. The tomb she erected to his memory was esteemed one of the seven wonders of the world. The name Mausolus has passed into a term which describes tombs of unusual size and magnificence. In 1856 the site of the tomb was discovered amid the ruins of Halicarnassus. From the measurement of the foundations and from the descriptions of ancient writers, Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, iv especially, it is inferred that the four sides of the tomb measured about 450 ft., and that from the base to the apex was about 250 ft. According to Fergusson, the tomb consisted of three parts or stories: the first, a species of basement; the second, the tomb proper, surrounded by a peristyle of Ionic columns; the third, or top portion, a pyramid surmounted by a four-horse chariot bearing a colossal figure of Mausolus accompanied and crowned by a female divinity; the whole enriched with friezes and ornamented with statues. Mr. Fergusson supposes that about the basements were rows of pedestals for additional statuary. Pliny's account is not clear and has been variously interpreted. The question is discussed with sufficient fairness by Fergusson. (James Fergusson: "The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, restored in conformity with the recently discovered remains. 4to, London, 1862.")

important portions. The figure is over 8 feet in height, noble and majestic. The face is evidently an unidealized portrait. It is square and short, with close-cut beard and mustache. The hair rises from the forehead and falls back to the shoulders. The mouth is firm, the eyes mild and strong. The drapery is admirably ordered. The chiton is rather narrow and reaches to the ankles. The mantle passes over the left shoulder and straight across the centre of the body. The sandals are particularly ornate. Mr. Newton supposes this to be the statue of Mausolus that stood in the four-horse chariot surmounting the edifice. There are many objections to this supposition. The statue, though colossal, is not of sufficient size to be conspicuous at an altitude of 150 feet. Nor does it correspond with the dimensions of the chariot, of which the wheels were over 7 feet in diameter, and of which the horses, to judge by fragments, must have been nearly 15 feet in length. The back of the statue is but roughly finished as if it stood in a niche or against a wall; besides, the ornamentation of the sandals implies a position where this ornamentation could be seen. Apart from these technical peculiarities the statue has more the appearance of a good work of the Roman period than that of a work of the 4th century B.C. If of the time of Mausolus it stands absolutely alone in Greek sculpture; for nothing of the period has been discovered that resembles it in style or in character. The face too, though fine, is more barbaric than classic; more suggestive of the descendant of a Gallic invader than of the ruler of a highly civilized Greek state. It is not without significance that Pliny, in describing the building, mentions the chariot but does not state that it contained a statue of Mausolus. Next to this statue there stands in the British Museum a female statue of similar colossal proportions which Mr. Newton supposes to have been a divinity standing by the side of Mausolus in the chariot and acting as charioteer. The hands of this figure are wanting and the face has been disfigured beyond recognition. The figure is richly clad; the chiton

is fine and reaches to the feet. The peplos, or mantle, falls from the back of the head and is gathered over the left arm after covering the front of the body from the breasts down. The face is surrounded by a triple row of volute curls. There is nothing in the style or attitude of the statue to suggest a divinity, much less a charioteer. The statue is undoubtedly a portrait, and is to be referred to that period of art when portraiture flourished. Apart from the drapery, these statues have but little claim to belong to an art-period of high development.

The friezes are more interesting as being presumably of the same date as the building. Such a difference exists in the size of the frieze fragments found, that it is supposed that the building was ornamented by at least four different friezes. The fragments which are the less injured, however, all belonged to the same frieze and all represent combats with Amazons. The fragments discovered by Mr. Newton are not only the best preserved, but those displaying the greatest artistic excellence. As Pliny states that Scopas had charge of the east end of the building, and as these slabs were found at the east end of the ruins, it may be that they are the work of Scopas himself. — *Ed.*]

Though the fragments are in very poor condition, they suffice to convey an idea of the great variety of the composition. Those combatants who fight in pairs are sometimes near together, sometimes quite a distance apart; the distance apparently depending upon the nature of the contest. Sometimes more than two are engaged together. Some of the Amazons are on horseback, some on foot. Great variety is shown in costume and weapon. The search for artistic effect controls throughout. The action of the Amazons is more passionate than that of the male warriors; but by the side of manifestations of intense passion are shown traits more true to woman's nature. In attack they are as wild as furies; in the moment of extreme danger they resort to entreaty.

There are no mythological individuals in the scene

unless Hercules is to be recognized in a figure which has seized an Amazon by the hair, has brought her to the ground, and is about to strike with an uplifted club.

If this frieze be compared with the frieze of Phigalia which is 100 years earlier, and where the theme is the same, not only will the artistic superiority of this frieze be recognized but marked differences in form and expression will appear. In this work form is slighter and more graceful. The drapery has not the stiff angular and formal folds of the Phigalian drapery, but is natural and flowing; while the faces are no longer the fixed and formal faces of the old style but show expression sympathetic with the action. The work is not free from a striving after purely physical effects. This is seen in the drapery of the Amazons. Some of them wear a garment opened on one side, and so arranged as to display a large part of the person. On some of the slabs the composition and the execution are admirable, on others there are errors so startling that it seems impossible that any prominent artist could have been employed on the work.¹

*THE VENUS OF CNIDUS.**

The Munich Copy.

(From Heinrich Brunn's catalogue of the Munich Glyptothek, No. 131.)

70. Of Parian marble. H. 1, 74. From the Braschi Palace in Rome. The upper part of the head is modern;

¹ These slabs have been studied by artists and critics, with more care than they deserve, in the hope of finding in them some clew to the style of Scopas. Their lack of authenticity, however, makes them of but little value in the search. Until some original work is discovered and identified Scopas can only be imagined as an artist of great fertility of invention, who appealed more to the senses than to the sentiments, who had neither the nobility of Phidias nor the delicacy of Praxiteles, but who understood the age in which he lived and most successfully ministered to its tastes.

² I give in order various works extant of which the originals are

also the nose, the tips of the lips, half of the right forearm, the left arm from the bracelet down with the exception of the palm of the hand, the feet, some parts of the drapery, and the vase.

The goddess is erect and bears the weight of her person upon the right foot. The right hip is so much curved that the equilibrium of the body is but just re-established by the left foot which barely touches the ground. The left knee is turned in and the left shoulder is somewhat elevated. The action is as if the goddess had been surprised and was turning her person away from the intruder. That this is the motive is made more clear by the action of the hands. The right hand covers the centre of the person, while the left which has seized some drapery from a vase (*hydria*) standing by draws it up towards the breast as a shield. The left upper arm is encircled with a bracelet. The hair is parted in the middle, is very simply treated, and is bound about with a double ribbon. The eyes turn slightly to the left. The position, action, and accessories, of this statue correspond so closely with the representations of Venus which occur on coins of Cnidus that it must be a copy, more or less remote, of the famous Cnidian Venus of Praxiteles. The statue has not the refined elegance of the Venus de Medici. Its forms are fuller, its composition simpler, its action far more natural. The whole attitude is more womanly, pure, and modest. Though the glance is seductive, as is becoming to the goddess of love, it is free from lust and coquetry. The execution, though of the Roman period, and though less finished than that of the Venus of Milo, or of the Venus of the Capitol, is still excellent. Soft harmonies so connect the parts that they seem pulsating with life.¹

attributed to Praxiteles. Of original works, the Olympian Mercury lately discovered is the only one satisfactorily authenticated.

¹ Pre-eminently the Venus of marital love. Surprise is immediately followed by the recognition that there has been no unlawful intrusion.

The Vatican Copy.

[The Vatican copy differs in some particulars from the Munich one. The hands are held lower down. It seems as if the left hand were about to allow the drapery to fall. The head is more turned to the right. The expression is very loving and tender. The hair is arranged in the same simple and characteristic manner. The forms are slighter and more maidenly. From the waist down the statue is disgraced and encumbered by a mass of tin drapery added by the pseudo-prudery of Pius VI. The statue is supposed to have belonged to the collection of the Cardinal Rovere and to have been brought by him to the Vatican when he was elected Pope as Julius II. With the exception of the head the execution is inferior to that of the Munich statue.]

There are many statues in the galleries of Europe in which the motive of these two is reproduced with greater or less modification, but so far as judgment can be formed these two stand nearest to the original. The Vatican artist may have intended to emphasize the action which with consummate artistic delicacy is sufficiently foreshadowed in the Munich statue. Mengs (*Opere. t. II, p. 6, Lettera a Mons. Fabroni*) mentions a head in Madrid that must have belonged to a copy quite as excellent as either of the two above described.

For the expression of true, tender, and at the same time passionate affection, the Munich statue is unrivalled. No work has been more highly praised by classic authors than the Venus of Cnidus. It and the Olympian Jupiter by Phidias are regarded by them as the supreme efforts of plastic art. See Overbeck's "*Die antiken Schriftquellen, etc.*," p. 236, u. f. — *Ed.*]

MERCURY AND THE INFANT BACCHUS.

71. [Fragment of a group discovered in the ruins of temple of Juno at Olympia in Ellis.]

The group represents Mercury bearing on his left arm the youthful Bacchus. He leans his left elbow on the top of the trunk of a small tree. He is entirely nude. His garments are placed on the tree trunk and hang down and about it in most beautiful folds. The little Bacchus has a mantle about his loins most gracefully arranged and gathered. Mercury probably held a herald's staff in his left hand and may have held a thyrsus in the right. The right arm from the end of the biceps, the forefinger and thumb of the left hand, and the legs from the knees down, were wanting when the statue was first discovered. A part of the plinth and parts of the feet were subsequently recovered. The ground where the parts were found had evidently not been disturbed from the time when the statue was overthrown, so that a reasonable hope exists that the remaining parts may also be found. Of the infant Bacchus, the head and several fragments of the body have been found. His right hand is on the left shoulder of Mercury; his left arm is entirely wanting. His right foot rested on a twig of the tree; his left hung free. No particular action can be inferred from the attitude of the head or from the expression of the face. Very noticeable is the very small size of the child in comparison with Mercury. A similar disproportion exists in the Munich group of Eirene and the child Plutus already described.

There can be no doubt that this is an original work by Praxiteles. Pausanias (v, xvii) in his description of the temple of Juno at Olympia, after enumerating statues of gold and ivory, states that subsequently (*χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον*.) other statues were dedicated in the temple, and that among them was a marble statue by Praxiteles of Mercury bearing the youthful Bacchus.

The location of the temple has been fully established; and it may be reasonably supposed that when barbarians or iconoclastic Christians destroyed and spoiled, the gold and ivory statues satisfied their cupidity and works of art in marble were left in the general debris.

Apart from historical evidence, the group is in accord with the ideas of the style of Praxiteles formed from the inspection of marbles presumably copies of his famous works. No known work of classic art compares with the group in grace, beauty, and harmony. It is as if a wave of infinite grace had flooded the perfect anatomy of the figure, blending the parts in a continuity of beauty. The beauty is nevertheless abstract. There is no nobility or force of character displayed. Nothing to excite veneration or to justify worship. It makes evident that the age of Praxiteles was an age in which the gods were no longer accepted as living entities of force or character ; but an age when art was devoted to the presentation of a beauty so extreme and so material that sensuality was suggested if not openly avowed.

The Mercury has many interesting peculiarities, among them :

1st. The great resemblance of the face to the face of the Venus of Milo. A resemblance sufficiently apparent to convince that the two must have emanated from the same school even if they are not the work of the same artist. The Venus of Milo is grander and may have preceded the Mercury, but the two are children of the same parents ;

2d. The attitude, producing a singular and very perceptible curving at the hip. A similar attitude is recognized in many of the statues which are supposed to be copied from Praxiteles ;

3d. The arrangement of the hair. The hair is divided across the head, and the locks that fall to the brow from the part differ from the rest of it. This same peculiarity exists in other statues which are of supposed Praxitelian origin ;

4th. The back is not so carefully finished as the breast, indicating that the statue was intended for a niche or for a position near a wall. Dr. Treu, of Berlin, is of the opinion that after the statue was finished the artist found the muscles of the back too strong, that he toned them down with his chisel, that he was interrupted in his work, and

that the marks prove that the chisel used was the same in shape as the chisel of to-day.

The genuineness of this work makes it a starting-point in the formation of a knowledge and of a judgment of the art of the period. — *Ed.*]

APOLLO SAUROKTONOS.

72. [Pliny mentions that Praxiteles executed in bronze a statue of a youthful Apollo aiming a dart at a lizard stealing towards him. (N.H. 39, 19. Praxiteles fecit et puberem Apollinem subrepenti lacertæ cominus sagitta insidiantem, quem Sauroctona vocant.) Of this original many copies are extant. The youthful god is entirely nude. His left arm is elevated and rests on the tree on which the lizard is crawling. In his right hand is held the dart. The body rests on the right foot. The left foot touches the ground back of the right one and nearly on a line with it. The right hip is much bowed. The copies are not all of the same size nor is the attitude always exactly the same. A bronze about four feet high in the Villa Albani was highly esteemed by Winckelmann, who thought it might be the original work. The Albani bronze is evidently a copy and is surpassed by many other copies. The best copy is of marble and is in the Vatican. Though much restored it is an excellent example of that grace in composition and that delicacy in execution which are Praxiteles's marked excellences. The attitude is most graceful. The forms are of womanly delicacy. The womanly appearance is further increased by the arrangement of the hair. The hair is long, parted in the middle, and gathered in a knot at the back of the head. Several German writers, Friederichs among them, have thought it a matter of importance to establish the fact that the god was not engaged in such an ungodlike action as killing a lizard. The question is without interest or importance, as it is evident that the artist's only intention was to present a conception of youthful beauty. — *Ed.*]

AMOR, KNOWN AS THE GENIUS OF THE VATICAN.

73. A marble fragment found near Rome on the Via Labicana by the Scotch painter Gavin Hamilton, purchased by Clement XIV, and at present in the Vatican. The legs from the thighs down are wanting, also the fore-arms. The head is turned to the right and is slightly bowed. The hair is thick, curling, and falls down on the shoulders.

The traces of wings on the back sufficiently indicate that the figure is Cupid. The ordinary supposition is that Cupid is represented in a melancholy reverie of love, himself a victim to his own power. There are, however, two other figures which so nearly correspond with this one that the three may be copies of one original. From the two, one in the Vatican and the other in the Naples Museum, this figure may be completed. The left hand held a bow : on the same side with the bow was a support upon which hung the quiver and a bit of drapery : upon the right was a small altar upon which the figure held an inverted torch.

According to this restoration the figure corresponded to figures occasionally seen on Roman tombs where Cupid is represented as the genius of death. The idea of grief, too, corresponds with the statue ; for the expression and attitude are more suggestive of deep sorrow than of the longings of love. As suggested by the Roman monuments the figure probably served as a funereal monument, or Cupid may be supposed to be mourning for Psyche.

The figure is regarded as a copy of a Cupid by Praxiteles. The supposition, however, rests entirely upon resemblances in the style of the figure to the style of Praxiteles. If the above explanation be correct the supposition is untenable ; for a mourning Cupid first appears on tombs of the Roman period and consequently cannot be of Greek conception. Again, the arrangement of the hair is too rich and elaborate to be of the time of Praxiteles, that is if judgment be formed from the Venus of Cnidus and from

the Apollo Sauroktonos. The hair is knotted in front after the manner of the ancient *krobylos*, while locks pass from one side of the head to the other as in later representations of children. These peculiarities may, however, have been added by a copyist. The execution of the figure is poor and betrays the copyist. The composition and the action are most delicate and graceful, pointing to a pure Greek origin.¹

THE ELGIN CUPID.

74. Discovered by Lord Elgin during his excavations on the Acropolis, now in the British Museum. The head, the arms from the middle of the biceps, and the feet, are wanting. The fragment has been united to a pedestal upon which is a left foot and a part of a right foot. The poor execution of the left foot excites a doubt as to its originality and also as to the originality of the pedestal. The fragment was found in many pieces and much damaged.

The absence of all traces of wings shows that this fragment has been incorrectly named. The name *Icarus* has been suggested; but to it the same objection exists, as even the band upon which wings could be fastened is absent. The band which passes over the right shoulder and under the left arm and which is tied in a knot on the breast can only be intended for the support of a quiver. As *Cupid* is excluded *Apollo* has been suggested as the other quiver-bearer, as he in the

¹ In spite of the poor execution this fragment is one of the most charming of ancient marbles. No statue is more quickly appreciated by the ordinary beholder. Face and attitude express melancholy (rather than grief) so gently and yet so profoundly that no observer can escape its influence. The arrangement of the hair is singularly beautiful and cannot be attributed to the vagaries of a copyist. *Praxiteles* is known to have executed several statues of *Cupid*. He indeed seems to have been the first artist who developed the character of the god as a subject for plastic representation.

Though there is nothing to prove that the Vatican marble is copied from the celebrated Thespian *Cupid* there is sufficient reason to justify its reference to the school of *Praxiteles*.

Sauroktonos and in the Apollino is represented with the same delicate and youthful forms. The long hair of which traces are left is another point of resemblance.

This beautiful work is an undoubted Greek original of the 4th century B.C.¹

APOLLINO.

75. Formerly in the Villa Medici in Rome, now in the Uffizi at Florence. Both hands are restored.

There are many antique statues in existence that correspond to this one in motive. They all may well be referred back to a Greek original; perhaps the statue that stood in an Athenian Gymnasium and which is described as follows: "The god leans against a column; in his left hand his bow, while his right hand, thrown over his head, conveys the idea that he is resting after a severe exertion." According to this account the bow should be added to the statue in question. In many copies a lyre instead of a bow is added and a trunk of a tree is substituted for the column. In each case the fundamental motive is the same. The origin of this figure cannot be later than the 4th century B.C.; for the soft and delicate treatment is not reconcilable with the stern and dignified conception of the gods which characterized earlier periods. The figure reflects a time when there was more fantasy than faith, and when wor-

¹ English writers who have the fragment and who have perhaps studied it closely adhere to the name Cupid. A peculiarity of the execution is that the strap does not appear at all behind and in front it is only indicated by small grooves in the marble, as if the band had been an after-thought and had been abandoned before completed. Perhaps the artist held the statue incomplete to answer the requirements of a purchaser. Mr. Edward Hawkins (*Marbles of the British Museum*, ix, pl. 2), writes of it as follows: "The position is easy and graceful, the forms are elegant and beautiful, the anatomy is well understood, the framework of the body is clearly indicated without exaggeration, and the disposition of the body is sufficiently expressed to evince the knowledge of the artist, while all the softness and delicacy of the youthful form are entirely preserved. The whole fragment is an exquisite production, and in its original unutilized state the figure must have been of surpassing beauty."

shippers perceived in their gods not the earnest powers of life but only poetical ideals. The original was probably of heroic size as many of the copies extant are colossal. This copy was probably made small to emphasize the gentleness and delicacy of the conception.¹

THE FAWN OF THE CAPITOL.

76. [A young fawn rests his right elbow on the trunk of a small tree of which a branch acts as a support for the right hip. The weight of the body is on the left leg. The right foot is back of the left and touches the ground with the toes only. The position of the feet is similar to that seen in the Apollo Sauroktonos and in other statues referred to Praxiteles. The left hip is much bowed. The left hand is against the hip. The right fore-arm extends at right angles from the stump. The body is entirely nude with the exception of a fawn's skin which passes across the breast over the right shoulder and under the left arm. The nose is short and slightly turned in. The mouth is not strictly sensual but is without moral or intellectual force. Its smile is the smile of abstract mirth. The ears are pointed and the hair coarse and heavy. All the unpleasant elements of the early satyrs have been eliminated. If the expression be hardly human it is entirely free from bestial instincts. In the Capitol statue the fore-arms are restored. The great number of similar statues in the various Art Museums of Europe points unmistakably to some one celebrated Greek original, while the attitude and the style are suggestive of Praxiteles.

Pausanias (i, xx) mentions that in the street of tripods there was a satyr by Praxiteles which the artist

¹ This little statue has been greatly praised by German critics and is assigned by them to the school of Praxiteles. It is at present covered with a wash which entirely hides the original surface. The original work may have been of impressive beauty, but all the copies extant are so destitute of every manly quality as not to be at all attractive.

considered as one of the best of his works. Pliny (xxxiv, 19) also mentions a celebrated satyr in bronze by Praxiteles, which was known to the Greeks as "Peribeotos," the much famed. Whether either of these is the original of the Capitol statue can only be conjectured. The forms of the Capitol statue, though not so slight and effeminate as those of the Sauroktonos, are still soft and gentle. They are most beautifully harmonized, the undulations of the surfaces flowing gracefully and musically together. The statue, however, can give but a faint idea of the beauty of the original.¹ — *Ed.*]

VENUS OF MILO.²

(From W. Fröhner. *Sculpture Antique Du Louvre*, 1876.)

77. For over fifty years the Venus of Milo has occupied the first rank among the chefs d'œuvre of ancient

¹ The above-described statues suffice to convey as correct an idea of the style of Praxiteles as can be had from existing monuments. There are many other statues in existence which criticism has assigned to Praxitelian originals; but the references are conjectures, and the works themselves are characterless copies. Neither authentic works nor classical reference suffice to convey a unified idea of the artist's genius. The works in existence show him as most skilled in presenting the softer and gentler emotions of the soul. He was neither heroic nor noble; nor on the other hand was he sensual. Though he used sensuous forms, they do not appeal to lust but convey impressions of grace and delicacy. That there was quite another side, or several sides to his character, is amply proved from classical authors. There are as yet no means of reconciling his varied accomplishments nor of forming a satisfactory idea of his individuality.

² Friederichs in his *Bausteine* assigns the Venus of Milo to a period subsequent to the periods of highest development. In the second volume of Carl Schnaase's *History of the Fine Arts*, collaborated by Friederichs, the Venus is, however, assigned to the school of Scopas. Overbeck considers it a work of the school of Asia Minor during the period of Roman domination. Julius Braun attributes it to Alcamenes. Ulrichs substantially agrees with him. In the absence of proof one opinion is as good as another. My own opinion is that the work is at least as early as the time of Praxiteles. Its resemblance in feature to the Olympian Hermes strikes every beholder. The arrangement of hair is very similar to that of the copies of the Venus

sculpture preserved in the museums of Europe. This supremacy has never been seriously contested. The statue represents a school that holds the middle ground between the art of Phidias, which still bears a reflection of the archaic style, and the art of Praxiteles, which is fine, graceful, spiritual, and entirely liberated from the restraints of early art. At the time the statue was discovered the first question presented was to ascertain its date. Students of Greek statuary soon discovered a great resemblance in the statue of the Niobe family in Florence. As the Niobe statues are generally attributed to Scopas the Venus of Milo may be assigned to one of his pupils, and is therefore of the 4th century B.C.¹

No assistance in the question of authorship is to be had from the few known facts in the history of the island where the statue was found. It is known that the ancient Melos was inhabited by a Dorian colony; that during the Peloponnesian war the Athenians took possession of it, massacred a portion of the inhabitants, and supplied their places with 500 Athenian colonists; and that after the

of Cnidus. These resemblances would seem quite enough to assign the statue to the school of Praxiteles. On the other hand the drapery with its sharp folds points to an earlier period. Nor as yet has any original or derived work by Praxiteles been found that compares with the Venus of Milo in nobility and serene dignity. Pliny (N.H., xxxvi, 4.) states that Alcamenes and Agoracritus, pupils of Phidias, entered into a competition, the subject being Venus; the Venus of Milo may be a repetition of one of their statues. The departures from perfect form, easily recognized in the statue, may have been owing to lack of skill on the part of the pupil employed by the master to make the repetition; or, on the supposition that the statue is an original work, to a faithful representation of some famous model. In the Venus of Milo there may be hidden the forms of Aspasia or of Phryne. A work of such superb magnificence can only be assigned to a late and degenerate art-period by those who have not seen it or by those who have no eyes to discover beauty. Overbeck, in his criticism, confesses that he had only seen a cast. Of all published descriptions I prefer that of M. Fröhner, who was for many years one of the conservators of the Louvre.

¹ The resemblance spoken of is not very striking though noticeable. The argument may just as well go the other way; that is, from Praxiteles through the Venus of Cnidus and the Venus of Milo to the Niobe group.

decisive victory of the Spartans in 404 the exiled Spartans returned to the island and drove out the usurpers.¹

The statue is nude to the waist. The legs are enveloped in drapery. The left foot is slightly elevated and rests upon an unrecognizable object. The chest is thrown back, the head is slightly turned to the left, and the left shoulder is slightly raised. The mouth is partially open. The waving hair is encircled by a band; three locks fall back on the neck. The ears are pierced for ear-rings. The back of the drapery is but blocked out, indicating that the statue stood in a niche. The nude, however, is as carefully finished behind as in front. The right arm from midway between the shoulder and the elbow and the entire left arm are wanting. The original position of the arms is a question which artists and critics have long and assiduously studied without as yet having reached any satisfactory result.

The opinion of Quatremere de Quincy² that the Venus was grouped with Mars has been generally abandoned. Neither the direction of the head nor the pose of the body accords with such a singular supposition. Most

¹ After 404 Melos could not have been of any greater importance than it was before. During the troubled period between 404 and 338 an original by Praxiteles could hardly have been secured by impoverished exiles. The theory that the Venus is a copy of the Venus of Cos and executed at a comparative late period is plausible. The fact that the statue may be of Asiatic marble is not without importance.

² A celebrated French archæologist of the early part of the present century. Zeit Valentin, a German writer, published in 1872 a singular discussion of the group theory, urging that unless supported in a group a person in the position of the Venus would fall, the centre of gravity being outside the support. ("Die hohe Frau von Milo, Zeit Valentin, Berlin, 1872.") As the statue is in two parts, a slight turning of one part upon the other would alter the pose. The questions involved in the pose are fully discussed by Felix Ravaisson. (*La Venus de Milo*, Paris, 1871.) Ravaisson favors the group theory. He also asserts that the marble is Parian and not the corallitic marble of Asia. The Venus seems doomed to be the subject of continued polemics. Even the plainest facts, and the most easily established, become in her case mere suppositions and vanish in thin air. Ravaisson also asserts that the Victory of Brescia was originally a Venus and that the wings and shield are additions of late date.

archæologists are of the opinion that like the statue of Victory at Brescia the Venus held a shield and rested her left foot on a helmet. Corinthian coins of the Roman period represent Venus in this attitude ; an attitude possibly derived from the armed Venus mentioned by Pausanias in his description of the Acrocorinthus (xi, 4). This supposition cannot, however, be accepted in view of the precise information extant as to the condition of the statue when discovered. Too little attention has been paid to the fragments which were found with the statue. These fragments most certainly belonged to it and fix the position of the arms beyond all possible conjecture. In her raised left hand the goddess held the apple, the prize of the victory decreed by the shepherd Paris ; while with her right she held her garments and prevented them from falling entirely from her person.¹

From an artistic point of view the appreciation of this statue is most delicate because it depends in a great measure upon individual sentiment. No antique statue in the writer's opinion presents so perfect a study of nature as the Venus of Milo.

The grand forms, the noble pose, the calm and impassive features, are all appropriate to the severe beauty of a goddess. But her dignity is rendered with a simplicity that shows no trace of labor. The graceful and flowing outlines show the vigorous and sparkling physique of youth, while the warm tones of the marble are most skilfully used to give the surface of the nude a soft and velvety appearance such as is not seen in any other production of sculpture.

The author of this inimitable chef d'œuvre must have worked from a living model ; for the statue contains certain irregularities which would have been avoided by an artist who was seeking an ideal and not obeying the truth. The head is comparatively small, the forehead very low ; the neck large, straight, and crossed by hori-

¹ In the very act of disclosing her beauty her victory was secured.

zontal wrinkles. The two corners of the mouth are not exactly the same. The right cheek is larger than the other, and finally, the left foot is executed so realistically as not to accord with the purity of the other parts. As to the drapery, it is almost diaphanous. To preserve the harmony of the general effect the artist has only indicated the indispensable folds. As a result of these observations it follows that the Venus of Milo is not a copy but a work essentially original.¹

*SILENUS CARRYING THE YOUTHFUL BACCHUS, GROUP
KNOWN AS "THE FAUN AND THE CHILD."*

(From Fröhner's Catalogue of the Louvre.)

78. This is one of the most celebrated of the Louvre antiques. Leaning against a small elm which is covered

¹ It would be impossible in this work to give all the history and criticism of the statue. The Venus of Milo has her own literature. The following compendium may serve as a guide in further inquiry:

The statue is $2\frac{3}{8}$ m. high, is composed of 7 pieces, the trunk and head (1, 2), the back hair (3), the legs, drapery and parts of each hip (4, 5, 6 and 7). A large part of the original plinth, and the arms with the exception of two fragments are wanting. The lobes of the ears were broken off when the ear-rings were stolen. The tip of the left breast is broken off. The left shoulder is much injured. The back is bruised in places. The tip of the nose is in plaster, also many of the folds of the drapery, particularly where the right hand was placed; that is, the plaster conceals all indications of the former presence of a hand. The fragment of an arm and the fragment of a hand holding an apple exhibited with the Venus are original and belonged to the left arm of the statue. All the injuries to the statue are now supposed to have been received on the island of Melos during a conflict between French and Turkish sailors for possession. The statue was found in February, 1820. The first account occurs in a report made by Dumont d'Urville, ensign of the French ship Chevette, which touched at Milo in April, 1820. D'Urville testifies to the existence of the arms and to their position. His report was subsequently altered to conceal the sailors' fight, which diplomacy decided should not have taken place. The statue was shipped on board a French vessel in May, 1820, and reached Paris in February, 1821. For a long while artists endeavored to restore the arms. Finally Louis XVIII, out of patience with the delays, ordered all attempted restorations stopped and the statue exposed to the public in the condition in which it is to-day. The plinth recovered with the statue did not

by a fawn's skin and entwined about with a vine Silenus holds the young Bacchus in his arms. The child stretches out his little hand in play; while Silenus, his face filled with gentle happiness, bends his head to meet the child's caresses. Silenus rests on his right leg. The left foot is placed in front and nearly on a straight line with the right foot. Both figures are crowned with ivy and corymbus.

The artist has represented Silenus as an old man who is still in the enjoyment of all his physical forces. Instead of giving him the ordinary appearance of satyrs he has made him as human as possible, only indicating the traits which show his parentage with the followers of Bacchus. The bald forehead, the burly figure, the goat-like ears and tail, the large belly, and the hairy skin, are so slightly rendered that they must be looked for to be perceived. As to the legs of Silenus, in the eyes of modern sculptors they are the most perfect that art has ever produced.

Pliny (N.H. xxxv, 29) mentions that in the portico of Octavia (curia, or schola, Octaviæ.) there were by unknown artists four statues of satyrs, one of which was

belong to it originally; it bore an inscription setting it forth as the work of "——sander, son of Menides of Antioch on the Meander." This plinth has disappeared. The parts of the statue are not put together accurately. If the parts were correctly adjusted the Venus would be more upright and not incline so much to the right.

Among the numerous works of the subject the following should be consulted:

Jean Aicard. *La Venus de Milo*. Paris, 1874.

Quartremère de Quincy. *Recueil de dissertations archéologiques*. Paris, 1836.

Comte de Clarac. *Musee*, vol. iv, 79, 82.

Comte de Valori. *Dissertation sur la Venus de Milo*. Paris, 1822.

Julius Braun. *Geschichte der Kunst*. V, 596.

Claudius Taral. Several contributions, one in the *Spectator* for 1861.

Ulrichs. *Skopas*, p. 122.

The literature on the subject is so abundant that it fatigues. Many of the questions involved are of no interest to the art-student, to whom it becomes a matter of indifference whether the Venus ever had any arms; for the wondrous and unequalled beauty that is still offered gives perfect satisfaction. No amount of technical or unfair criticism on the part of English and German writers can alter one whit the estimation in which the Venus is held by all true lovers of beauty. The very departures from perfect anatomy are additions of pleasure and interest.

pacifying a crying child. The motive described by Pliny may possibly be the original motive of the statue under consideration. The invention of the motive undoubtedly belongs to the school of Praxiteles. The head of the Silenus has been broken off and replaced. The end of the nose, some locks of the hair, the hands, the wrists, and three toes of the right foot, are modern. The right leg has been repolished. The child is about half modern. The tree trunk and the ornaments upon it have also been much restored.

The group is in grecchetto marble and was found in Rome during the 15th century. There are two well-known repetitions; one in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican, the other in the Glyptothek of Munich.¹

THE BATHING VENUS.

79. [Venus in a crouching attitude rests one knee on the ground and is apparently being bathed by her attendants. There are many repetitions of this statue which only differ in unimportant particulars. Two are in the Louvre; in one, the Venus reaches her right hand behind her head and covers the right breast with the left hand; in the other, the arms cross in front of the person, the left hand is held down, and in the right the restorer has placed a bow. There are other examples in Rome, Florence, Naples and Madrid. Sometimes a small Cupid is grouped with Venus. Pliny (N.H. xxxvi, 4.) mentions a Venus at the bath that stood within the Portico of Octavia. According to one reading of the text Pliny attributes the work to Dædalus of Sicyon, an artist of repute during the 4th century B.C. It seems hardly possible that so realistic a conception could have emanated from the best period of Greek sculpture. The statue is strictly sensual. When executed there can have existed as little respect for

¹ The manner in which the figure of Silenus rests against a tree, the holding of an infant, and the straight line of the feet, are well-established peculiarities of the school of Praxiteles.

art as for the goddess of love and beauty. The number of copies points to a celebrated original; and if that original was executed in Greece during the 4th century B.C. and is typical, then knowledge of Greek civilization of the time is still limited and inexact. The work is more suggestive of Pradier than of Praxiteles. — *Ed.*]

THE GANYMEDE OF LEOCHARES.

80. [Leochares is mentioned by Pliny as a rival of Scopas and as one of the artists who with Scopas was employed on the decorations of the Mausoleum. (N.H. 36, iv.) In another chapter of his Nat. Hist. (xxiv, 19.) Pliny puts among the artists in brass a Leochares who, he adds, among other statues executed a Ganymede borne away by an eagle, the eagle showing such consideration for the boy that his talons do not injure him. There is in the Vatican a statue that has been regarded as a marble copy of the original bronze. The eagle has seized the boy beneath the arms and with outspread wings and upturned beak has already commenced his flight. In the Vatican copy the group is supported against the trunk of a tree at whose base is a musical instrument and a dog howling at the loss of his master. The antique portions of the work are of great beauty. The head and wings of the eagle, the head, arms, and portions of the legs, of Ganymede, and all of the dog but his feet, are modern. Several quite similar works all point to one celebrated original. Though the composition is realistic and playful it is in keeping with the character of the myth. In the Vatican example the drapery which falls between Ganymede and the tree trunk is admirably managed. It seems as if gently agitated by the effect of the upward flight. — *Ed.*]

RELIEFS FROM THE MONUMENT OF LYSIKRATES.

81. In ancient Athens there was a street called the street of tripods. Along its sides were columns, or small

temple-like edifices, on which were placed the tripods won in musical contests. The victor, that is the person organizing and conducting the victorious chorus or orchestra, had the right to have his name and the names of his musicians inscribed on the support of the tripod. There still exists in Athens one of these peculiar edifices. It is called the lantern of Demosthenes, popular tradition claiming that Demosthenes retired to it for purposes of study.

It consists of a round shaft about six feet in diameter with Corinthian columns let into it, resting upon a rectangular basement, and surmounted by a short and highly carved support upon which the tripod immediately rested. The whole structure is about 30 feet high.¹

The columns have Corinthian capitals. Upon the architrave is an inscription, and above it the frieze to be described. The inscription assigns the victory to Lysikrates and places it during the archonship of Euainetos, that is in 334 B.C. The victory was probably obtained during a festival to Bacchus as the subject of the frieze relates to that god.

The subject is the punishment of the Tyrrhenian pirates who seized Bacchus when a youth intending to carry him off and sell him, but who were quickly punished for their audacity by the god who turned them into dolphins. The subject as depicted on the relief does not accord with written tradition. Tradition speaks of the god alone, and mentions none of his followers in the affair; but the sculptor, needing more figures, has introduced a number of satyrs taking such part in the punishment of the robbers as to emphasize the humor which appears in the original myth.

The scene is supposed to pass on the shores of the sea, and Bacchus and his followers are supposed to have been feasting when the pirates make their assault. The god

¹ The masonry between the columns and forming the shaft though antique probably did not form part of the original building. I was unable (1878) to make a close examination.

from whom the wonder-working power proceeds is seated in the midst sporting with his panther. He is, apparently, unconscious of the terrible transformations that are taking place. It would have been unworthy of the god if the artist had represented him as obliged to make any exertion to bring discomfiture upon his enemies. Not so the satyrs who are represented as breaking boughs from trees with which to belabor their hapless adversaries, or as prodding them with the torches of the Bacchic night festival. Even the Bacchic snake takes part in the fray. He binds with his folds and wounds with his fangs one of the robbers. The scene is further enlivened by figures half man half dolphin which spring into the sea. All that part of the scene which shows the beating, the binding, and the burning, of the pirates is original with the sculptor and does not at all appear in the written tradition.

The figures in the frieze are arranged with the greatest symmetry. The central group, which is marked off by two large wine-vases, consists of five figures of which the central one is the god. He, seated in a most graceful attitude, is apparently offering his panther a sip of wine. On each side of the god is a seated youthful satyr, and next to each satyr another satyr standing by a wine vase; one about to replenish a smaller vessel; the other, pouring from the smaller vessel into a drinking-cup.¹

The youthful Bacchus is surrounded by youthful satyrs who by their more ideal figures seem the better formed to be his playmates; while the punishment of the pirates is left to elder and rougher satyrs, to whom a touch of the comic is often added.

¹ This group of five, though the figures are small and the execution only that of an ordinary stone-mason, is one of the most beautiful and one of the most valuable productions of ancient art. There is no composition extant in which parts are adjusted with such perfection of harmony. With this group well impressed on the sentiments and on the understanding it would seem difficult for the artist to go far astray when composing.

On each side of the central group are two standing elderly satyrs, who though they take no part in the conflict beyond look towards it and thus form a connection between it and the central group. One offers a cup of wine to another who apparently has no time to drink but hurries to the fight. The other leans his elbow on a pedestal over which he has thrown his fawn's skin so as to be ready at a moment's notice to take his part in the fray. Then follow on either side most lively scenes of actual encounter. The robbers do not offer the slightest resistance; but are cudgelled, burnt, upset and tossed into the sea, in a helpless, hopeless, and very entertaining manner. A humorous sympathy is excited for their misfortunes.

In tragedy and in matters of dignity and importance transformations are rather indicated than represented by the arts of design: for instance, the transformation of Actæon is shown by horns growing from his forehead; that of Daphne or that of the Heliades, by a tree standing near, or by twigs growing from the head or from the ends of fingers. In comical scenes, however, like the one under consideration, the actual mingling of natures may be shown. Here the comical effect is further increased by causing the transformation to begin with the head. Resemblance to tritons is also thus avoided. Particularly excellent is the movement of the half-transformed animal.

The work is conceived and executed with great freedom and ease. In a more exact style the figures would have been closer together and spaces better filled up. The artist has made the best use possible of the flying garments of the satyrs, but there are still spaces that impair the unity of the composition.

The work was produced under the influences of the younger Attic school, as appears from the slender forms and especially from the graceful figures of Bacchus and the satyrs near him. Satyrs do not appear of such grace and delicacy till the time of Praxiteles.

Genre and Historic Representations.

The majority of the works to be mentioned under this head are portrait statues, and among them are some that cannot with certainty be assigned to this period. They are retained, however, to prevent the interruption of an instructive and interesting train of development; for nowhere is the transition of Greek art from the ideal to the real more easily followed than in the domain of portraiture.

The bust of Pericles mentioned in a former part of this work is much farther removed from actuality than that of Demosthenes which will be described in this part. Taste for reality and interest in materiality increased in art as it did in other departments of Greek culture. There is even shown a willingness to carry the representation of truth to the inclusion of ugliness and deformity.

This important change in the history of Greek art occurred during the time of Alexander the Great, and the first and most important artist of the new departure is Lysippus. He belonged to the Peloponnesus, in whose schools there had always prevailed a tendency to realistic representation; though up to his time a severe and formal technique had kept it within narrow limits.

THE APOXYOMENOS.

82. A marble statue found in 1849 by Canina¹ in the Trastevere, Rome; at present in the Vatican.

The statue is one of the best preserved of antiquity. The only parts restored are the fingers of the left hand and the die they hold. The restoration was made by Tenerani on a wrong understanding of a passage in Pliny.²

¹ Cavaliere Luigi Canina, Architect and Professor at the Art Academy of Turin, a profuse writer, commenced publishing about 1830.

² Cavaliere Pietro Tenerani, a celebrated modern Italian sculptor,

The statue represents a naked youth holding in his left hand a strigil or scraper with which he is removing from his body the dirt and perspiration resulting from an athletic contest. In attitude and expression there is a sense of satisfaction as if the contest had been successful.

The work is a copy of a celebrated statue by Lysippus. It is known that this artist executed an *Apoxyomenos*, and in this copy are found the peculiarities of style attributed to him. The head is small and the figure slight, points in which the works of Lysippus differed from those of former artists. There is an appearance of greater delicacy than actually exists, which makes the contrast all the greater with those early works which appear thick and heavy.

The grace of the light and elastic body, with which the arms and limbs are in perfectly harmonious proportion, is typical of a time when earnestness and solidity of character has been displaced by the refinements of culture. It is also reported of Lysippus that he was the first artist who took nature as his supreme guide; the first who, as this statue shows, freed himself entirely from all the formalities and restraints of early art.

Forms and action are thoroughly natural. Even the hair is no longer in formal parallel lines, but is tossed about as nature tosses it.

That the original was in bronze is easily inferred. The outstretched arm is a motive that would not have been selected for a work in marble. The remains of a support show that a support was necessary in executing the marble copy. In the original bronze no support to the arm was necessary, nor could the side support to the

pupil of Canova, and later of Thorwaldsen. The passage in question occurs in a notice of Polycleitus, a contemporary of Phidias (N.H. xxxiv, 19.). In it Pliny states that Polycleitus executed a statue of a man using the body scraper, also of a man challenging to play at dice, etc., etc. The mistake made was in supposing that the two descriptions referred to the same statue, and that the statue in question was a copy of it.

figure have existed. The management of the hair also recalls bronze work.

The original by Lysippus was highly esteemed in Rome. Agrippa very appropriately placed it in front of his baths. Tiberius, who greatly admired the statue, removed it to his palace, but was compelled by the people to restore it to its former position.¹

THE REFLECTING DISKOBOLOS.

(See article on the Diskobolos of Myron.)

83. A marble statue in the Vatican found in the second half of the last century by the Scotch painter Gavin Hamilton in the ruins of an ancient building on the Appian Way. The fingers of the right hand and some unimportant bits are modern. The restoration of the right hand is undoubtedly correct.

The youth is intently considering how to throw the discus which he still holds in his left hand, while he raises his right hand with an involuntary gesture as if he wished to call his own attention more closely to his own act. This unstudied gesture, this unconscious monologue, gives the statue a simple and naïve expression which is without affectation and seems entirely the result of concentrated thought.

Goethe, noticing the *Cena* of Leonardo da Vinci, said that the picture with its lively gestures could only have been painted by the native of a southern country where

¹ Though Lysippus was the favorite sculptor of Alexander the Great and undoubtedly the greatest artist of his time, and though his works were numerous, this statue is the only one extant that can be assigned to him with any reasonable certainty, and even about this one there are doubts and questions. As Hercules was the favorite divinity of Alexander, to whom indeed he was happy to have himself likened, the chief occupation of Lysippus during a certain period of his artistic career was executing statues of Hercules and busts of Alexander. That some of the types thus created survive in copies cannot be doubted, though as yet no clue has been found to attach them to the originals.

nature requires vivid expression. This remark applies well to Greek sculpture. The statue is a speaking example of the manner in which, among a demonstrative people, the emotions betray themselves at once in gesture.

The lively poetry of the attitude, the objectivity, the self-forgetfulness, the beauty and harmony of forms, make it possible that the statue is a Greek work of the best period. Its perfect naturalness would assign it to the fourth century or to the end of the fifth. To judge from the head, the work is Attic.

The supports have led to the idea that the statue is a marble copy of a bronze original; but the supports are unnecessary for the marble, and may have been left for security in transportation. If the band about the head were the fillet of victory it would have a bow falling behind.

THE PRAYING-BOY OF THE BERLIN MUSEUM.

84. [The early history of this most beautiful bronze is obscure. According to one account it was found in the Tiber; according to another, in Herculaneum. At one time it belonged to Prince Eugene of Savoy. It was finally purchased by Frederick the Great, and, with the exception of a short sojourn in Paris, has ever since been the joy and pride of Berlin. The statue represents a naked youth looking upward with his arms outstretched in prayer. It is supposed to be a youthful athlete imploring the assistance of the gods in an approaching contest. The slightness of the form, and the arrangement of the hair which is quite like that of the Apoxyomenos, have led critics to assign the statue to the school of Lysippus. No more beautiful bronze has been recovered from antiquity. The entire freedom from self-consciousness, and the complete absorption of the youth in his prayer, are expressed most truthfully and most artistically. The work is an original of the best period of Greek sculpture. If not of the school of Lysippus, it cannot

be later than the time of Alexander. Its strictly human character prevents its being assigned to an earlier period.

The right arm is a comparatively modern restoration. It is inferior in workmanship to the rest of the statue, and does not bear the same marks of what is technically called patina, or the rust of age. The metal is singularly thin. The statue does not weigh a third of the ordinary weight of antique bronzes of the same size.

Bœdas, a son and pupil of Lysippus, is mentioned by Pliny as having executed in bronze a figure in adoration. (Plin. xxxiv, 19.) — *Ed.*)

THE THORN-EXTRACTOR.

85. A bronze statue in the Capitol at Rome. The eyes are wanting. They were probably silver or gems. The figure is that of a seated boy extracting a thorn from his left foot which he holds on his right knee. The boy is bent over and is entirely absorbed in what he is about. The pouting lips add to the intensity of the expression. The statue has been incorrectly classified with a statue by Boethus of a boy struggling like a goose. Though the time when Boethus lived is uncertain, it was probably subsequent to the Alexandrian epoch; while the arrangement of the hair of this statue would refer it as far back as the time as Lysippus. The forms are of great beauty and delicacy. The work is undoubtedly an original and of the best period.¹

THE SO-CALLED PHOCION OF THE VATICAN.

86. A marble statue found in 1737 on the Quirinal. The left hand, the thumb and first finger of the right

¹ Visconti supposes the statue to represent a boy who has been victorious in a running match in spite of his having stepped on a thorn. The custom of representing victors in an attitude to recall some incident of the contest dates from the middle of the fourth century B.C.

hand, and a part of one of the legs, are modern. The figure probably held a sword in the left hand. The great simplicity of this statue has secured it its name, though according to classical authors Phocion did not possess the mild countenance that is here shown. The statue is in fact too general in its character, individuality is too little expressed, for any name to be assigned with accuracy. In order to give a name to a statue it must have some individual mark for identification. That the statue is a portrait statue is nevertheless evident from the individuality that appears in the face; this individuality is, however, toned down and modified in a most admirable manner.

The work is an excellent example of that portraiture whose object it was to make noble men appear nobler and to confine individuality within the simplicity of a great ideal. This very simplicity makes the statue grand and impressive.

The artist has not given the figure the garb of actual life, but has clothed it simply in the knight's mantle; this, with the helmet, distinguishes the warrior. The quiet attitude, the absence of action in the arms, the thick stuff of the mantle making few folds, all these are quiet protests against excessive individuality. The only action seen in the figure is the little that is absolutely necessary to prevent formality and stiffness. It may be inferred that such gentleness of manner was a trait of the person represented.

That this statue was highly prized by antiquity is shown by the fact that Dioscurides, the greatest stone-cutter of the time of Augustus, copied it in a statue of Mercury.¹

SOPHOCLES.

87. A marble statue found buried in the yard of a private house in Terracina. At present in the Lateran

¹ Amphiarus, Adrastus, and Aristomenes, are other names which have been given to the statue. No more admirable example of early portraiture has been recovered.

Museum in Rome. The left hand, both feet, and the basis with the roll-case, are modern. The roll-case is the attribute of men who have distinguished themselves in the field of intellect, and is ordinarily found with statues of poets, philosophers and orators.

The poet whose features are known from busts which bear his name is supposed to be here represented triumphing over the two tragedians whom he so often surpassed in actual dramatic contests. This idea is suggested by the band of victory about the head, and also by the look and attitude which express the highest satisfaction. On the other hand it may be doubted whether the band indicates victory, or whether expression and attitude do more than show the ordinary character of the poet.

The selection of age is very happy. A philosopher is thought of as an old man; a poet, and such a poet as Sophocles, should be represented in the fulness of life and vigor. Sophocles, as the ideal poet, should be a combination of intellectual strength with grace and beauty of form. The statue, moreover, shows a person not inattentive to personal appearance. The folds of the dress and the arrangement of the beard show equal care. The strong, firm attitude show a poet who neither believes in an inspiring familiar spirit nor in divine frenzy, but one who trusts his own innate powers.

The arrangement of the hair would seem to point to a bronze original. It is quite similar to that of the Apoxyomenos. The work appears to be of the time of Alexander, and to occupy a position midway between ideal and individual portraiture.

*THE BONN DOUBLE BUST OF SOPHOCLES AND
EURIPIDES.*

88. A marble bust discovered in 1845 in Rome not far from the Porto S. Lorenzo; acquired for the Bonn Mu-

seum by Professor Welcker.¹ This representation of Sophocles is more true to life than the one just described. The profile, especially, is far less idealized. Still the contrast with the strictly individual head of Euripides is very striking. The sunken cheeks and the hair, thin on top and long at the sides, of Euripides express fatigue and suffering, while Sophocles shines forth as a strong and self-satisfied nature. The elevated eyebrows of Sophocles give him an expression of nobility, while the carefully arranged beard shows that the wearer was not entirely indifferent to external appearances. In this singular composition the artist has been most successful in emphasizing the contrast between these two tragedians which their works offer; the inner satisfaction of the one, the unhappy doubting of the other.²

MENANDER AND POSIDIPPOS.

89. [Two marble statues in the Vatican. During the Roman period they probably stood in some one of the public baths. During the middle ages they were set up in the church of S. Lorenzo in Panisperna, or Panisperna, and were worshipped as images of saints. To this odd worship of these Greek dramatists is due the admirable preservation of their statues. When Sixtus V was cardinal he discovered the true character of the statues and had them removed to his villa on the Esquiline. In course of time they found their way to the Vatican.

The two poets are represented seated on cushioned chairs, which have high, broad, rounding backs. Each is clothed with the chiton and has a long mantle wrapped about his person. The attitudes, especially that of

¹ Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker, one of the most noted of the German archæologists of the early part of the present century.

² Double busts are odd productions of Greek art. There are many of them in the museums of Europe. The above is given only as a specimen. See Welcker, *A. D.*, v, p. 40.

Menander, are easy and unconstrained. The left arm of Menander is over the back of his chair; the left arm of Posidippos is slightly raised as if in meditation or address. The conceptions are admirable; the treatment broad and noble. Though more individual than the Phocion, they are sufficiently generic to belong to the highest type of portraiture.

Pausanias (i, 21.) mentions a statue of Menander that stood in the theatre at Athens, and an inscription lately found in Athens apparently belonged to a statue of Menander executed by Kephisodotos and Timarchos, two sons and pupils of Praxiteles. As the two statues evidently correspond, the two may have emanated from the school of the great master.

There is some authority for supposing that the statues in the theatre at Athens were bronze. There is certainly something in the treatment of the drapery and of the hair of these statues to suggest bronze originals. The heads still show traces of the fastenings by which the halos were attached when the statues figured as saints. The marble is Pentelic; the execution rough and, in parts, unfinished. — *Ed.*]

HOMER.

90. [There are very many busts and statues of Homer in existence. Of them all the Potsdam bust and the British Museum bust are the most impressive. They each represent the poet in advanced age as seems appropriate to the father of all poetry. In the Potsdam bust the eyes look upward and the blindness is admirably expressed. These two busts are purely ideal, as Homer lived long before the beginning of portraiture. They are of admirable workmanship and are to be referred to the best period of portraiture. The London bust was found in 1780 on the site of the ancient city of Baiæ. The Berlin bust formerly belonged to the Polignac collection. — *Ed.*]

THE DEMOSTHENES OF THE VATICAN.

91. The orator is represented erect. His mantle falls from the waist and is thrown over the left shoulder, leaving bare the right arm and breast and the left forearm. The forearms and hands are modern. The hands as restored hold a parchment. If this restoration be correct the statue cannot be a copy of the statue in bronze by Polyeuktos, as in that statue the hands were together. (Plut. Demos., 30 and 31.)

The Demosthenes of the Vatican is one of the most admirable works of antiquity. It is very individual, and in this respect shows a strong contrast to the Phocion type. The individual traits of the orator, however, are rendered with so much artistic force that the statue is a representation of the ideal orator who by great effort has overcome natural impediments to success. Even the stammer is evidenced in the conformation of the lips. Intense concentration of thought is most admirably and truthfully rendered. Though the statue is so individual as to be suggestive of the Roman period, its great excellency as a work of art has caused it to be referred to the time of Alexander.

DIOGENES OF THE VILLA ALBANI.

92. A marble statue at present in the Villa Albani. Both arms from the elbow, the left leg, and the right leg from the knee, are modern. The dog and staff are also modern. The restorations are probably correct, at least the staff seems quite appropriate to the bent figure of the aged philosopher. Diogenes is recognized by comparison with other and well-known statues; though a comparison seems hardly necessary the statue is so highly characteristic. It is a capital example of the fact that in historical portraiture the Greeks were not governed by actual appearance. Their aim was characteristic

representation, and if character could be strengthened by nudity the person was presented naked. Diogenes was called by a Roman poet a naked cynic. His nudity seems also appropriate to a philosopher who stated that the gods wanted nothing and that godlike men need but little. The long and unkempt beard is another characteristic of Diogenes.

To represent the ugliness of a naked old body would never have been dreamt of during the ideal period of art. Such statues could only have been made when historical interest in the individual was so strong as to lead to the sacrifice of beauty to character. The statue on artistic grounds, therefore, must be referred to as late a time as the time of Alexander, whose death indeed coincided with that of Diogenes. At the same time the statue must be regarded as Greek; for it represents too lively a recollection of the personality of Diogenes to be of the Roman period.

ÆSOP.

93. Fragment of a marble statue in the Villa Albani. The right shoulder is a modern restoration.

It is unnecessary to discuss the question whether *Æsop* ever lived; for all his statues, like those of Homer, are ideal. Their very diversity shows that artists were not governed by historical information. One artist has indeed gone so far as to represent him as a negro. If certain general traits have been preserved by all artists, it is only because those traits represented to them the typical poet of the fable. Representations of *Æsop*, therefore, must be regarded and analyzed in a general and typical light.

The peculiarity of this bust is that though it represents an ugly hunchback he is shown to be neither suffering nor depressed, but he holds up his clever head with content and self-satisfaction.

The fable-poet, especially the Greek fable-poet, could

not be represented in ideal beauty; for his themes are comparatively unimportant. Moreover Greek fable is neither epic nor didactic. It does not deliver its lessons openly and directly, but in the form of bright and witty narrative. It has not a free manly tone; but is sharp, even sly, in accomplishing its purposes. These characteristics of fable shine forth in this fragment. A hunchback cannot go boldly and strongly forward in his pursuit, for he has neither the force nor the authority; but that cunning which so often gets the better of force is his particular heritage.

The artist in making the hunchback naked has not hesitated to represent repulsive ugliness; but the head, with its pose and its sharp look, attracts more than the body repels.¹

¹ In a work of this character it would be impossible to describe even the most noted of the portrait statues which have been referred to the Alexandrian period. There is, besides, uncertainty on the subject. The dividing line between Roman and Greek portrait statues has not been clearly drawn, nor can a date be fixed for the origin of portraiture. My own opinion is that portraiture in sculpture is of earlier origin than is generally admitted. It is certainly more reasonable to suppose that the real preceded the ideal than that the real was the outcome of the ideal. The Indo-Germanic race has changed so little in traits during the last six thousand years that it is quite safe to judge the Greeks from our own point of view. Common-sense would suggest that as soon as sculpture had the power, it would be employed in perpetuating the features of the celebrated and of the beloved. Portraiture is certainly as old as Phidias, or that artist would not have been condemned for carving his own face on the shield of Minerva; nor would he have thought of carving it if portraiture had not been general. Portrait statues of the best periods have disappeared because individuals were as little thought of then as now. Besides the best talent was devoted to religion; for it was more of an honor to make a god to be worshipped by many than to make an ancestor to be revered by a few. Of the Roman period portrait statues abound, because each Cæsar was divine and celebrities were demi-gods.

PERIOD OF THE DECLINE OF GREEK ART.

This period embraces the three centuries between Alexander the Great and the Roman emperors. A poor and inactive period if the meagre extant accounts of its art-activities are to control judgment; but on the other hand a period that appears to be of great richness and variety when the works that must be assigned to it are examined and appreciated.

The art of this time is at its worst in the domain of the ideal, and especially of the religious ideal; for belief in the reality of the ideal and moral earnestness in the representation of divinity had departed.

The period received as an inheritance certain sensual tendencies. Starting from these it goes so far as to offend, if not to disgust, not only in representations of men but even in representations of gods. Even those statues of the gods which do not offend fail to appeal to religious sentiments. Religious art has gone so far in the way of materialism that it is entirely occupied in the production of beauty and is no longer under the influence of any of the abstract principles of religion. The artist who in the absence of divine inspiration no longer loses himself in the subject-matter of his work compensates himself by a devotion to the charms of form. So comes it that now there is an elegance in art for which former periods were too simple. Now for the first time luxury and sensuality are set forth with seductive grace. It follows naturally that most of the works of the period are in marble; for marble is the material art chooses when it would appeal to the senses.

Though artists thought more of themselves and of outer refinements than of the subject-matter they have nevertheless left evidences of great skill and of great versatility.

They made statues of the gods which are noble and impressive. In the domain of the naïve, the idyllic, and the humorous, there are works that are full of a most charming grace. Especially remarkable are the works of the school of Pergamus in which no longer the ideal, but the historic and the individual are presented with all the force and truth that are proper to personal episodes. The historic was precisely the element that was the best adapted to occupy the artistic intellect of the times.

The most important of those works which can be assigned to definite schools will be first considered; then those works that seem to be artistically related to them. No definite chronology can be assigned to these, however, for the differences between this art period and the Roman are not so clear that works can be divided with anything more than an approach to accuracy.

THE GROUP KNOWN AS THE FARNESE BULL.

94. A marble group discovered in 1546, or 1547, during the pontificate of Paul III in the baths of Caracalla in Rome. It was at first in the Farnese palace in Rome. In 1786 it was removed to Naples and after standing awhile out of doors in the Villa Reale it was finally removed to the Museum. The group represents Amphion and Zethus tying Dirce to the horns of a bull. The figures are Dirce, Amphion, Zethus, the bull, a shepherd boy and dog, and a female figure that may be the genius of the place where the tragedy took place, but which is usually called Antiope.

The group has been very much restored. The principal restorations are as follows: the whole of Dirce from the navel up; of Amphion, the head, both arms with the exception of the hands, both legs with the exception of the feet, the extremities of the drapery and the upper part of the lyre; of the figure known as Antiope, the head, both arms and the lance — this figure had also been broken in two near the feet; of the bull, the fore legs,

and the hind legs with the exception of the hips; of Zethus, the head, both arms, the left leg with the exception of the foot, and the right leg; of the shepherd boy, the left arm and the right forearm. The dog is all new with the exception of his paws. The restorations were probably made in the sixteenth century by Guglielmo della Porta. For the head of Zethus, the artist seems to have taken a head of Caracalla. Under the bull is a large hole that goes through the entire support, and which was probably made at the time the group served as a fountain in the Farnese palace.

The restorations can hardly be entirely correct. Dirce is so disconnected from the other figures that it may well be wondered why she does not run away. Her position, moreover, is not a natural one. There is in the Naples Museum a cameo on which the scene is engraved, and where correspondence with the group is so accurate so far as the bull and Amphion go, that in other respects the two should correspond. According to the cameo Dirce should be so restored that, while Zethus holds her by the hair with his left hand and she clasps Amphion's knee with her left hand, her person and face are more in profile and her right arm is more elevated. In the cameo the rope is already about her person; and as it is already fast to the horns of the bull, her horrible punishment will commence as soon as her hold on Amphion is broken. Such a restoration would not only be more technically exact but would increase the pathetic intensity of the scene. That the more cruel part of the execution is assigned to Zethus is in accordance with his character. It is to the gentler Amphion, so shown by his lyre, that Dirce appeals for pity.

It must be confessed that the group is offensive to modern taste, nor would it have been less offensive to the taste of a noble period of antiquity. If the punishment were seen to come from a god, as in the case of the Niobe and the Laocoon, sentiment would not be so outraged; but here man inflicts the punishment, and in such a manner

as to make it appear to be the satisfaction of untamed passion. Even the reflection that Dirce prepared for the mother of the youths this same martyrdom which she herself is about to suffer does not lessen the horror which the scene inspires.

The artists worked after one of the plays of Euripides' in which, as in many of the writings of the same poet, though punishment be just, infliction is so passionate and so cruel that the idea of justice is destroyed. Nor did they consider that scenes which the poet may narrate become offensive when literally rendered in art. The moment selected however, if not artistically satisfactory, is the moment of the scene best adapted to excite the emotions, and is therefore characteristic of the times in which the artists lived. The bold, the unusual, the exciting, were preferred to the simple, the pure, and the noble. The group, though skilfully conceived and executed, is not entirely satisfactory to the eye. It produces a disquieting impression. It is more picturesque than plastic. The realistic representation of the locality of the action is something quite new in art. In the bases of the Niobe statues there is a suggestion of realism; but here the realism is far greater, and is used to increase the terror inspired by Dirce's awful fate. Some of the details are of value in making clear the circumstances of the tragedy. The wicker basket used at festivals of Bacchus, the broken thyrsus, the ivy garland, and the fawn's skin about the neck of Dirce, all show that she was in the midst of Bacchic feasting when her terrible fate overtook her. The seated boy on the right is probably the genius of the locality; for only such a being could observe such a tragedy with comparative indifference. He looks as if he could not move from his seat, and it may be that he is rooted in terror to the spot and that his expression was intended by the artists to be sympathetic and not apathetic. Garland and fawn's skin are given him to show that he too participated in the Bacchic ceremonies. His size is small, as is appropriate to a personage who is only an

incident in the scene. Near the body is a *syrinx*, the musical instrument appropriate to herdsmen. The figure of the dog, suggested by the figure of Zethus, harmonizes with the lines which surround the composition; but it is a trivial addition. The other animals sculptured about the base are not so unmeaning. The snake, for instance, is often a guest at Bacchic festivities, and may be supposed to have crawled out of the basket.

The remaining figure, called Antiope,¹ was artistically necessary to fill out a corner of the group. Her presence too was necessary to enforce the moral; for the threat to her was the cause of the disaster to Dirce. The restorations of this figure cannot be correct; for she seems to be entirely indifferent to what is going on. Some interest must have been shown by pose and gesture. Perhaps as indicated by a Pompeian picture she even expressed pity.

The group was undoubtedly intended to be examined from all sides. The best impression is to be had from immediately in front of Dirce. The group is regarded as an original, though the treatment of the drapery might well excite a doubt on the subject. The over and under garments of Antiope run together in such a way that they cannot be distinguished. Even the drapery of Dirce, though artistically conceived, is poorly executed. Be the group an original or a copy, it is undoubtedly the work mentioned by Pliny as belonging to Asinius Pollio and described as follows: "Zethus and Amphion with Dirce the bull and the halter, of one piece, the work of Apollonius and Tauriscus, brought to Rome from Rhodes." This passage seems to establish the group as of Greek and not of Roman origin. It was probably executed subsequently to the time of Alexander the Great; for it is in advance of the dramatic element that prevailed in Athens during the fourth century and which is illustrated in the Niobe. This development of the dramatic and its expansion into

¹ Antiope, a fragment.

the pathetic and the thrilling were the special study of the school of Rhodes which flourished so brilliantly during the third century.

*THE VOTIVE OFFERING TO THE ATHENIANS OF
ATTALUS II, KING OF PERGAMUS.*

95. On the Acropolis of Athens and near the southern wall four groups of statues were to be seen. One represented the fight of the gods with the giants; the second, a contest of Athenians with Amazons; the third, the battle of Marathon; and the fourth, the destruction of the invading Gauls in Mysia by King Attalus. They were all presented by the king, who in true Greek fashion wished to connect his victory with great historical and mythological events. The example had been set by the Athenians themselves; for in a hall of one of their public buildings there were pictures of the battles of Oenoe and Marathon by the side of pictures of the Trojan war and of the war against the Amazons. In the groups of Attalus further resemblances were suggested; for the Amazons might well be compared with the Persians and the Giants with the Gauls. The selection had artistic advantages also; for the Gauls and the Giants were fierce of character and would naturally be represented naked, while the Persians and the Amazons were gentler and would be represented clothed. Their clothing too, would beget still further diversity; for the Asiatic garb of the Persians would contrast finely with the classic drapery of the Amazons. That the figures were quite numerous is probable. Pausanias mentions that they were about two cubits long.

There are several statues in existence which correspond in size, in character, and in action to the account given by Pausanias and which undoubtedly belonged to the groups in question. There are three in Venice that belonged to the Gaul group. The first represents a youthful warrior lying on his back and dying; the second, an

old warrior partially clothed, beaten to his knee, but still fighting; and the third, a naked youth who is apparently falling over backwards. These statues came from Rome about the beginning of the sixteenth century, a present from Cardinal Grimani to his parent city.

The three are evidently Gauls. The dying youth has at least two characteristics that identify him as a Gaul. The shield that lies under his outstretched left arm is the six-sided shield peculiar to Gauls, and still more characteristic is the girdle about his body. It is well known that Gauls in the excess of their courage often went into action naked, or with simply a girdle about their persons. These girdles not only exist in art but they have been actually found, and are of the twisted rope character presented here. The distinct peculiarities, however, of the Gaul are not so strongly presented in this figure as in the others; as here the artist has evidently endeavored to increase pathos by giving the figure more of an ideal character. The youth has fallen under three wounds; one is a cut and the others look as if they were from stones or arrows; at all events it seems as if such wounds could not have been given by sword or lance. Of the elderly man still fighting on his knee, the entire right arm is modern but undoubtedly correctly restored. In this figure the barbarian is very plainly displayed in the features and in the coarse hair. The mantle, too, that goes about his body and over his left shoulder is not of Greek pattern. The third statue, which also represents a youth, has been very much restored. Both arms, part of the base about the left hand, and the left leg from the knee down, are modern. These restorations are hardly correct. The left hand probably held a shield; the right a sword. The present imploring motion of the left hand is out of character. In this figure the barbarian nature is strongly expressed.

To the same Gaul group belong two statues which went with the Farnese collection from Rome to Naples and which are now in the Naples Museum. One represents a nude and helmeted warrior sinking in death. He rests on his left

thigh and still supports his body with both hands. The attitude is very similar to that of the so-called Dying Gladiator of the Capitol. The helmet does not distinguish the barbarian; for it is the same as that worn by both Greek and Roman; but the features, in spite of the absence of beard, are seen to be of the same barbarian type as the features of the other statues. The second Naples figure is that of an aged warrior stretched out on his back in death. Half of the right leg, and half of the fingers of the right hand, are restorations. In this figure the barbarian type is more strongly expressed than in any of the others. Hair and beard are wild and coarse. Hair is indicated not only under the arms but on the breast; a practice that occurs only in representation of barbarians or of such inferior personages as Marsyas for instance. Moreover, instead of a garment, a skin is about the left arm. He has fought desperately till the very end; the right arm is still in the attitude of attack, and the hand still grasps the sword. By his side is his girdle. It is not, however, of the same material as that of the figure already described. One or two other figures are in existence which may also relate to the victory of Attalus. It is very evident that the figures must have been on a low elevation, for the gaze must be directed downward in order to see those that are outstretched. There is nothing to show the manner in which the figures were grouped. The presence of the dead and the dying would seem to indicate that combatants were not in pairs, but that groups were formed about the fallen. It is somewhat singular that all the statues discovered so far should be of the vanquished.¹

¹ There are many statues in the various museums of Europe that are supposed by critics to belong to this group or, if not to this particular group, to one of the four. Overbeck mentions three in the Vatican, five in Paris and two in the Castellani collection at Rome. There is also one in Dresden. The question as to which of these, or of other statues, did or did not belong to the groups is an entertaining one for the close investigator. The student of the fine arts will find that the statues mentioned by Friederichs fully represent the style and fully serve the purpose of tracing art development.

There are also in Naples two figures that are supposed to belong respectively to the Marathon group and to the Amazon group. One represents a dead or dying warrior lying on his right side. His arm is stretched out towards his sword which lies on the ground beside him. He wears trousers, and a cap that resembles the Phrygian cap. The other statue is that of a dead Amazon. She lies flat on her back; her right side, breast, and arm, are bare, and her right hand is stretched out beyond her head. Beneath her person is the broken spear from which she received her death-wound. In reference to the first figure, it is not absolutely certain that it represents a Persian. The cap is not exactly the Persian cap. It has the Persian top that falls over, but the side-pieces are wanting. The figure, too, is without the long-sleeved garment of Persia. Nor is the shield Persian. The sword, however, has the curved blade that was not used by classic people, but which at the same time was not peculiarly Persian. It is a question whether the figure be not that of a Gaul, as Gauls at times wore trousers and also caps that were not unlike the Phrygian caps; as shown by the Dacians or Trajan's column.

The Amazon, as has been stated, lies upon the spear that gave her her death-wound; while her own spear lies broken by her side. Though form is perhaps too strong and manlike, the expression of death is most quiet and peaceful.

It is not known whether the statues presented by Attalus were in bronze or marble. They were more probably marble, as so many statues in bronze would have been too much even for the purse of an Attalus. The works in existence certainly have the appearance of original works, nor is it very probable that so extensive a work could ever have been copied.

As to the artistic character of the statues, they present the pathos of the fourth century combined with a naturalness that is free from every restraint. The subject chosen naturally led to a realistic representation. Artists of

better periods, indeed, only idealized the Greek type; while the barbaric type always led to individualization. There are also early representations in which the barbaric is quite as admirably characterized as here; but the union of the pathetic with the natural is the new, the characteristic, and the impressive, quality of these groups. In pathos, the marbles of the Mausoleum approach the nearest to these works; but there the realistic is absent. In this connection it must not be overlooked that in the Greek face the expression of passion was limited by the very form of the features themselves.¹ In these groups, and especially in the two Venetian figures where the fight is being still kept up, for the first time in the history of art the domain of actuality is reached.

In the reliefs on Trajan's column reality is carried still further. There it is apparent that the artist's intention was to perpetuate the remembrances of actual occurrences; while here nudeness, which there does not at all appear, is an indication that those influences of Greek art were still prevailing by which the actual was limited and controlled by the characteristic.

THE SO-CALLED DYING GLADIATOR.

95. A marble statue found during the 16th century in Rome; at first in the Villa Ludovisi, now in the Capitol.

The right arm and that part of the base on which the right hand rests are said to have been restored by Michael Angelo. The sword, one end of the horn, the left knee-pan, and the toes of both feet, are also restorations. The sword has not been restored in keeping, and the end of the horn should have been made to resemble a mouth-piece.

¹ Nonsense! The ideal Greek face may not be easily associated with an expression of intense passion; but the actual face of Greek history, so far as it may be known from busts and from accounts, was quite as well made for expressing passions, and bad ones too, as the face of any Dacian or Gaul.

The restoration of the right arm has not escaped criticism. It has been suggested that the arm should be straighter with the hand more to the front, thus giving the body better support and avoiding the parallelism of the two arms. The original parts of the base, however, determined the distance of the hand from the body, and an outstretched arm would imply a degree of strength no longer possessed by the dying warrior. The wound he has received should evidently control the position. The limbs of a wounded man naturally draw together and towards the wound. Here the position of the right arm and that of the right leg are clearly seen to be occasioned by the wound in the right side. The right arm supports, but supports in a position as near to the body as possible.

The dying warrior is a Gaul. Classical descriptions which give exact accounts of the personal appearance and of the weapons of the Gallic race leave no doubt on the subject. The shield is not specifically Gallic. A shield of the same shape appears on the arm of a Roman soldier on Trajan's column. A similar horn, also, occurs in Roman relief. The horn led Winckelmann to the singular conclusion that the statue represented a Greek herald. It has been mistaken for the Gallic girdle already mentioned. The nature of the object seems abundantly clear; as it is hollow, has a trumpet-shaped end, and has a band attached to it. The warrior has about the neck, however, an unmistakably Gallic ornament, the well-known torques. The beard and the hair are further proofs of nationality. The mustache when worn alone is distinctly Gallic; and the hair of the figure has evidently been stiffened with wax after the Gallic fashion so as to stand upright and to resemble a horse's mane (Diodorus, v, 28, sqq.). The barbarian is also recognized by the hands and the feet; for though the form is slight, masculine, and beautiful, the extremities are somewhat clumsy. The thick skin and the many wrinkles about the hands are further indications of the absence of that idealism

which is always present when a Greek is the theme. The prominence of eyebrow is another peculiarity and is intended to increase the expression of fierceness which is always given to barbarians. Some minor parts of this statue are treated with a truthfulness of detail not to be found in any other statue of antiquity.

The warrior is evidently dying by his own hands, preferring death to slavery. He has not lost his ornament nor one of his weapons. He lies upon his shield, and he has broken his horn before it becomes the booty of his foe.

The impression produced by the statue is unspeakably pathetic. The Gaul dies sternly and without complaint. His pride burns fiercely to the very end. A Greek is more delicately constituted and art represents his death more ideally, more in the spirit of elegy.

The supposition has been advanced that the figure stood in a pediment. It is certainly so shaped as to fit into the corner of a pediment, but there is nothing else to justify the supposition. On the contrary, the figure, the base, and the implements sculptured upon it, are so composed as to be complete in themselves. The pediment theory rests, therefore, upon the idea that the statue is a modified copy.

It is impossible to determine the date of execution. Only an approximation can be suggested. No Greek artist could have produced such a work before Greece had come into contact with the Gauls. In other words the statue must have been called into existence by events of history, and no such events occurred before the third century B.C. During the third century invading Gauls were defeated in Asia Minor and also on Grecian territory, and statues were erected to commemorate the victories. The statues of this character presented by King Attalus to the Athenians have already been described. It is also known that a number of similar statues were executed in bronze for the same king. Some critics assert that the technique of the statue in the Capitol

proves it to have been copied from a bronze original. In this case it may very well be that the original was one of the statues executed for Attalus. The statue does not, however, present those resemblances to the votive statues of Attalus which would be expected if they all emanated from the same school and were all executed at the same time. In one of the Attalus statues the position is very similar, but the similarity is not so great that one position must of necessity have been derived from the other. The Gaul of the Capitol shows more character than the votive statues, and is executed with greater truth to nature.

It also presents a different proportion of parts. The head is larger in proportion to the body than the heads of the others. These differences suggest that the Gaul of the Capitol may be of another period and perhaps of Roman work. The numerous conflicts between Romans and barbarians afforded sufficient suggestion for such a statue, and works which have been preserved show what admirable representations of barbarians were executed during the Roman period; the *Thusnelda* of Florence, for instance, or Trajan's column, or the *Amendola* sarcophagus of the Capital on which a combat between Romans and Gauls is depicted in the liveliest manner.¹

¹ It is absurd to suppose that Attalus, who was the richest sovereign of his times, should have sent statues to Athens and have left his own capital bare; that he should have celebrated his victory abroad and not at home. A reasonable supposition is that some of the statues of the votive group that related to his victory are reduced copies of statues that adorned his own home. The resemblance between the Capitoline Gaul and one of the Naples figures is greater and more important than Freiderichs admits. Not only are the positions very similar but motive, spirit, and conception, are identical. The two must have come from the same school and have been produced at the same time. Antonio Nibby, a learned Italian of the first part of the present century, was the first to discover and to explain the true character of the Capitoline statue. Up to his time it had been known as the dying gladiator. As this name has been consecrated by Byron it is likely to adhere to the statue forever. In no work of ancient or modern art is death portrayed so impressively, so pathetically, and yet so perfectly within the bounds of the best and the truest art. Whatever school produced it, it is a work of transcendent genius. If of the school of Pergamus, as there seems good reason to believe, then

THE GAUL GROUP OF THE VILLA LUDOVISI.

97. A marble group in the Villa Ludovisi representing a Gaul who after having killed his wife kills himself, death being preferable to slavery. The Gaul holds his dying wife by the left arm, while with his right he plunges his sword into his own breast. The right arm of the Gaul and the hilt of his sword are modern; also the left forearm and the right hand of the woman. The restorer has represented the Gaul holding his sword as in battle, so that in its present position the thumb is nearest the body. It is a question whether the hand should not be reversed and the sword held as a dagger, as the forearm and the elbow would be lower down and a better view of the face would thus be obtained; besides, the blow would be stronger and surer. The restorer's idea was that the foe was so near at hand that there was no time for the Gaul to change his grip, and that the blow with which he killed himself followed instantly the blow with which he killed his wife.

The situation seems to be this: the Gaul during the fight looks back and sees his wife in danger of capture; with rapid strides he outstrips his foes who were bent on her capture and is in time to kill both her and himself before capture is possible. The group illustrates most strongly the unyielding pride of the barbarian and his undying love of liberty.

This group and the Gaul of the Capitol are evidently

the artists who served Attalus understood the human heart, and had skill and power to effect it, as no other artists before or since. The fact that the statue is as carefully finished behind as in front is no argument against the pediment theory; because so were the figures in the pediments of the Parthenon. But there is an argument in the fact that a back view tells the story so clearly, perhaps even more pathetically than the front view; for the back must have been made to be seen. The statue is so independent in conception and in technique that no definite place can be assigned to it in the history of art development. There is nothing extant that leads up to it or away from it. In this respect it is like the Laocoon.

of the same school and of the same period. Even the ornamentations of the two shields are similar. There are also other details that confirm the relationship. The dying wife makes a most touching contrast to the wild passion of the husband. In her, too, the barbarian is seen: her hair is unkempt and unbound, while the broad face is in strong contrast to the typical and classical face of Greek art. The fringe on the drapery may be an indication of superior rank.¹

THE GIANT RELIEFS FROM PERGAMUS.

98. [No more interesting discoveries have been made of late years than those made by the Prussian government on the site of the ancient city Pergamus.

After the death of Alexander, Lysimachus made Pergamus his treasure city. Here were all of the vast treasures collected by Alexander which Lysimachus was able to gather. He put in charge an eunuch named Philetærus. Philetærus was faithful for a while, but soon concluded that in such troubled times he was justified in looking out for himself. So he took advantage of an early opportunity to declare himself independent, treasures and all; the treasures no doubt helping on the declaration. For one hundred and fifty years the family of Philetærus were among the most enlightened and powerful sovereigns of Asia Minor. Eumenes II, ruler from 197 to 159 B.C., was the most powerful and the most successful of them all. It was during his reign, probably, that Pergamus received its greatest embellishments. Lucius Ampelius, an unimportant writer of the second century of the present era, in describing the wonders of the world mentions

¹ This group and the "Dying Gladiator" are the most intensely pathetic statues of antiquity. The "Dying Gladiator" must be placed first as a work of art; as it combines, unifies and harmonizes the impression made by both the Gaul and his wife. The Gaul is receiving his death-wound, his wife is already dead; the "Gladiator" is midway between, and reveals the whole tragedy of death.

in these words an altar at Pergamus (*Liber memorialis*, cap. 8): "Pergamo ara marmorea magna, alta pedes quadraginta, cum maximis figuris; continet (or continent), autem Gigantomachiam. In Pergamus there is a very large altar about forty feet high on which are large figures representing the fight of the giants." I give the Latin text as it is given in Overbeck's *G. der G. P.*, vol. ii, p. 230. In all other texts that I have seen there is a period after *figuris* and the singular *continet* is given. The text may just as well refer to statues within the building as to figures on the outside of it.

This was in all probability one of the buildings with which Eumenes II adorned his city. The history of the discovery of the ruins of the Acropolis of Pergamus, of this altar, and of the reliefs surrounding it on which were represented the fights of the giants, with most interesting details, is in "*Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen zu Pergamon*, etc., etc. Berlin, 1880." It is sufficient for the purpose of this work to know that several of the reliefs were found in so good a condition that a satisfactory idea can be had of the character of the sculpture of the whole. The slabs, which are about seven feet high, are in the Berlin Museum and are most highly prized by German critics; some enthusiasts going so far as to rank them with the Elgin marbles. Many of the figures are in high relief, and show great technical skill. As works of pure and high art, however, the reliefs are of little value, German professors to the contrary notwithstanding. They are interesting and excite wonder, but they are so materialistic as to be almost barbaric. None of the best characteristics of Greek art appear. They recall such works as the frieze of Phigalia, or of the frieze of the Theseus temple, while their size prevents them from being regarded as architectural ornaments. A description of a few of the scenes will make clear the character of the sculpture. Some of the slabs were found built into a wall with their faces turned in, and in this way were admirably preserved.

A set of four slabs represents Jupiter engaged with three giants. To the extreme left is a seated giant. Only a part of the legs and abdomen, and the outline of the back, have been preserved. Stuck right through his left leg is one of the largest of Jupiter's thunder-bolts. It consists of a handle and of three prongs going out of each end of the handle. Two of the prongs at the lower end of the handle pierce the left leg, while the third prong goes between the two legs. Those parts of the legs and of the abdomen which have been preserved are of excellent workmanship.

The second slab is almost entirely occupied by the figure of Jupiter. The legs of the seated giant stretch into it, while the left arm and leg of Jupiter pass into the third slab. The right arm of Jupiter, which is almost entirely wanting, was stretched out into the first slab and, according to some critics, was receiving another thunder-bolt from one of his eagles flying to his supply. The head of Jupiter is missing. His figure, nude to the thighs, is massive, energetic, and not without grandeur: the physical grandeur of an athlete, however, and not that of a god. Of the ideal, or of the divinely sublime, there is not a trace. On the third slab is the figure of a youthful giant on his outstretched knees. He carries his left hand to his right shoulder as if he had just received a painful blow. Some German critics suppose that the attitude shows the beginning of rigidity produced by a blow of the ægis which Jupiter is supposed to be holding forth in his left hand. In the upper part of the slab, above the head of the crouching giant, the composition cannot be made out. There are wings, flowing mantles, and parts of the ægis, and another eagle may be bringing another thunder-bolt for his master's use. The third slab presents the back of a mature giant whose legs, in accordance with later art, terminate in serpents. His head is turned to the left and his left arm is stretched out into the uncertainties of the upper part of the third slab. The extreme upper parts of all the slabs have disappeared.

The composition is certainly grand and interests as would a magnificent boxing-match, or a well-contested bull-fight; but the scene is too realistic to be regarded as a work of art. The actual piercing of a leg by a tangible thunder-bolt is as far from true art as possible; while the eagles with their supplementary ammunition suggest the opera of the extreme future.

Another set of four slabs represents Minerva taking her part in the affray. On the left-hand slab is a youthful and winged giant. He rests on his right knee and extends his left leg and his left arm straight out into the second slab. His right arm goes back of his head and clasps Minerva's right arm; she with her right hand has seized him by the hair and pulls his head back and to the left; the action turns his head up and gives him an expression of distress. On the second slab Minerva herself is seen. On her breast is the ægis; a shield is on her outstretched left arm; she turns her head to see that her hold of the hair of the luckless giant already mentioned is secure, and hastens to the right of the composition. On the next slab is the goddess Gæa rising from the earth. Her head and breast are already above the soil. She turns her eyes to Minerva with an expression of agonized pleading for her children. With her right hand she tries to clasp Minerva's knees. In her left she holds up the horn of plenty which distinguishes her. Above her, and sweeping from the fourth into the third slab, is a winged and a flying figure of Victory, hurrying to lay a crown on the head of the conquering Minerva.

These two scenes are the best preserved of the series. There are other slabs on which realism is carried still farther. Hecate, for instance, is represented with two heads, and as fighting with four arms: one holding a shield, one dabbing a torch at her adversary, and the other two fighting with sword and spear. The snake legs of the giants bite and entwine at long distances from the bodies to which they belong. Eagles, dogs and lions take part in the general fray.

Fragments of another series of slabs have been found which belonged to a frieze of smaller dimensions, supposed to have ornamented the inner side of a colonnade which surrounded the altar itself. These slabs are so injured by time that but little can be made out of them. Some undoubtedly refer to the history of Telephus, the son of Hercules, who in this part of Asia Minor enjoyed a renown but second to that of his father. The slab in which Hercules is represented discovering his son is supposed to indicate the composition of the original group from which the Farnese Hercules may be derived. The Pergamus friezes are grand and vigorous realistic representations, but they can hardly be regarded as works of art. The high praise they have received from German art-critics must be partially attributed to national pride. They are most interesting and valuable as revealing the character of the civilization of the time of Diadochi and as showing the changes effected by the Macedonian supremacy. They should be studied from a historic and an ethnological, but not from an artistic, point of view. As works of art they not only produce dissatisfaction but they may do injury; for they are strong, attract attention, and may lead the mind away from fidelity to the pure principles that should govern in relief. — *Ed.*]

THE VENUS OF CAPUA.

99. [A marble statue found about the middle of the last century in the ruins of the amphitheatre of Capua; at first in the royal palace of Caserta, now in the Naples Museum. The statue is clothed from the waist with drapery which resembles the drapery of the Venus of Milo. The arms, the point of the nose, and the drapery about the left knee, are modern. The base on which the statue stands is large enough for another figure. Some time during the early part of the present century a Cupid was added; this has been removed. It would be well if the modern arms were also removed, as they only serve to

embarrass and to confuse. The statue wears a crown and the left foot is on a slight elevation. One notion is that Venus, with the crown of Juno, the spear of Mars, and with her foot on the helmet of Minerva, is represented as triumphing over these three divinities. Another critic imagines the goddess to be represented in the act of giving directions to her youthful son. Friederichs agrees with those who would restore the figure holding the shield of Mars and contemplating her beauty reflected from its polished surface. All critics agree that the statue is of Roman workmanship, but many claim that it must be a copy from a famous Greek original and that the original may well have been the Venus of Milo. In fact, the chief prominence given to the statue has arisen from the attempt to make use of it in solving the mysteries that shroud the Venus of Milo. The statue, though by no means without beauty, is in every particular so inferior to the Venus of Milo that judgment cannot be led back from it to the other.

The Venus of Capua is a skilful adaptation of the type of the Venus of Milo and nothing more.—*Ed.*]

THE VENUS OF ARLES.

100. [One of the most beautiful statues of antiquity, and one which would receive more attention were it not in the Louvre where it is overshadowed by the Venus of Milo. It was found in 1651 at Arles in the ruins of the Roman theatre; was presented by the city to Louis XIV, and for many years was one of the chief ornaments of the palace of Versailles. The right arm and the left forearm are modern. The restorer placed an apple in the right hand, which is elevated, and a mirror in the left. The mirror has been removed. The head was found apart from the body and is of most singular beauty. Some enthusiastic French critics assert that so beautiful a head could only have emanated from the school of Praxiteles. The breast is exceptionally flat. It seems as if it had been

worked over and as if the flatness had been imparted accidentally.

This statue is rarely mentioned by German authors and then only to call attention to the defective flatness, so lively in German minds is hostility to the French in general and "le Grand Monarque" in particular. The restorations were made by François Girardon, the great sculptor of the great king. Clarac suggests a different restoration. He would put a lance in the right hand and the shield of Mars, or of Minerva, in the left. Fröhner states that the marble is from Mt. Hymettus, and claims that the statue is an original of the best period of Greek art. It is more likely a Roman copy; but a most admirable copy and one undoubtedly taken from a celebrated original of, probably, the Alexandrian period. There is certainly a faint reflection of Praxiteles in the beautiful head; but the work of the copyist, or of the careless restorer, is evident. In 1823 there was discovered at Arles one of the most beautiful of all Venus heads and one greatly resembling the Cnidian type. As Arles was named after the Julian family (Colonia Julia Arelatensis), and as the Julian family were descended directly from Venus through Anchises, the worship of the goddess was very prevalent in the town. — *Ed.*]

THE TOWNELEY VENUS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

101. [A marble statue found at Ostia in 1776 by Gavin Hamilton and acquired by the British Museum with the Towneley collection. The statue is over six feet and a half high. The left arm and the right hand are modern. The statue is nude to the waist. The drapery, which is bold, rich, and admirably executed, is supported by the hips and by the left forearm over which an end of it falls. The restorer has given the statue an elevated left arm. The original action can only be conjectured. The statue is in two pieces, joined together at the edge of the drapery; and the upper part is of a lighter color than the

lower. It is stated that it was partially owing to this fact that the statue was gotten out of Italy as parts of two statues, the law not opposing the exportation of fragments. This fact also makes it probable that the statue is of Roman workmanship, though its very great excellence certainly points to a Greek original and an original of a very high period of art. Of all other well-known Venus statues it most resembles the Venus of Arles of the Louvre. The action of the hands is different, however. The Venus of Arles holds the garment over the left arm instead of over the right. Both statues are examples of the purer and the nobler conceptions of the goddess.

During the season of 1775 Gavin Hamilton found, also at Ostia, a smaller statue of Venus which is also in the British Museum. This little statue, which is but three feet high, is greatly admired by English critics, but hardly noticed by the German. The statue is entirely nude with the exception of some drapery which in falling has been caught between the knees. The arms and hands are modern. The left hand has been restored as if the goddess were regarding herself in a mirror, while the right hand covers the centre of the person. The body and the head bend slightly and gracefully to the right, and the weight of the person rests principally on the right foot. The head has been broken off and replaced. There is a projection on the right cheek that has given rise to many speculations. One supposition is that the statue is not Venus but the goddess of silence and that the right hand was raised to the lips in the gesture of silence. A better explanation, on the supposition that the right hand was raised to the face, is that the gesture was of shame or indignation at being unexpectedly discovered. This motive accords with the action of the knees which are endeavoring to prevent entire nudity.

Friederichs writes that the statue is of little value. Mr. Taylor Combe states that it was "executed in the finest style of Greek work."

Though Venus statues of this small size were executed principally as ornaments for baths, etc., they nevertheless were often copied, or derived, from celebrated originals. A singular type is that in which the garments clothe the person from the hips down, while an end of drapery is caught under the left arm, and passing up to the top of the head, serves as a species of head-covering very like the modern Italian head-dress. An example is in the Dresden collection. The best example is said to be in England in the Gray collection. Venus holds her head-dress with her right hand, her left rests on the tail of a dolphin which is straddled by a Cupid. The goddess with satisfaction beholds her image reflected from water at her feet. In the Dresden example the head is more upright and the gaze is directed forward. The right hand has been restored so as to rest on the hip and the left hand, also a restoration, holds a vase. The Cupid does not appear. Another example is said to be in the Blundell collection at Ince Hall near Liverpool. — *Ed.*]

THE VENUS OF THE CAPITOL.

102. A marble statue found about the middle of the last century in the valley between the Quirinal and the Viminal. It was found walled up as if to save it from harm. Benedict XIV placed it in the Museum of the Capitol. The statue is remarkably well preserved. The surface is almost as fresh as when the artist completed his work. The tip end of the nose, the forefinger of the left hand, and a bit of the right hand, are the only restorations. The goddess has dropped her garments on the vase at her side and now quite naked is ready for the bath. Her nudity excites a sense of shame which is manifested in the attitude of the body and in the position of the hands. The forms are far riper and more womanly than those of the Venus de Medici, whose youth may seem more appropriate to the situation; but here modesty is more apparent.

This work is undoubtedly a Greek original. In no

statue of Roman origin, so far discovered, is there that representation of life which shines forth in Greek originals, and which in the nude of this statue is so wonderfully true and so wonderfully brilliant. In no other statue of antiquity is marble shown to be so admirably adapted to render the soft elasticity of flesh.

In seeking a date for the statue, the Venus of Cnidus must serve as a point of departure. The motive is the same but further developed. The Venus of Cnidus still hesitatingly holds her garments in her hand. There is also a difference in the conceptions. The Venus of Cnidus belongs to a simpler and severer art tendency; this Venus is not free from a striving after effect. In the one, the hair is arranged simply and naturally; in the other, it is ornamental and arranged to attract attention. In the Capitol Venus the garments are adorned with fringe and the elegant vase is more ornamental than useful.

The statue is probably a Greek original of the post-Alexandrian period.

THE MEDICI VENUS.

103. A marble statue found in the Portico of Octavia at Rome; at first in the Villa Medici at Rome, now in the Cabinet of the Uffizi in Florence. The right arm, the left forearm, the front of the base bearing the inscription, and a part of the chin, are modern. The antique part was found in eleven pieces. The dolphin indicates Venus as Anadyomene, Venus rising from the sea. The goddess is therefore entirely nude. The expression of the face and the position of the arms indicate surprise; but there is no trace of that modest shame which is seen in the Cnidian Venus and in the Venus of the Capitol, no consciousness of nakedness, no evidence of fear. The forms are tender and beautiful. Of all the nude statues of Venus this is one of the most youthful. The idea of divinity preserved in the larger and more mature forms of

early art has entirely disappeared. The artist seems to have intentionally kept away every suggestion of divinity. While in the Venus of earlier art forms are larger than nature, here they are less. A colossal Medici Venus would be a singular anomaly, while in the Venus of Milo size is an essential element. The small face is lustful. Sensuality is especially marked in the eyes, of which the lower lids are more strongly drawn up than in any other statue of the goddess. The dimple in the chin, which would be incompatible with serene and dignified beauty, is quite in keeping with the youth and sportiveness of this toying goddess. The hair was undoubtedly gilded, and arms and ears were jewelled, to make the appeal to the senses more seductive. It is a question whether this far-famed work is after all an original. There are copies of it which, though inferior in execution, seem to approach nearer to a purer original. As the original type must have been used for purposes of religion it seems impossible that it should have been so destitute of purity and nobility as this example. Moreover this particular statue, as the place where it was found proves, was only set up to decorate a public hall.¹ The inscription on the base, as already stated, is modern; if copied from the old inscription, then the statue was made by Kleomenes the Athenian, the son of Apollodorus.²

¹ Undoubtedly during the Roman period the statue was only regarded as decorative, but if it be a Greek original brought to Rome it may well have been worshipped at home. The fact must be recognized that there was a time in Greek history when art was pornographic, and that statues of the Medici type were conceived and executed for the sole purpose of exciting desire, and that the excitation of desire was a phase of worship. This idea must be fully accepted in the study of works of this character; that is, if one wishes to study them. A Greek would have been the last person in the world to claim for them any quality different from that which they so clearly exhibit.

² The statue is four feet eleven inches and four lines high. Brunn's conclusions are, that there were two artists of the name Kleomenes, that they were father and son, that they were Greeks by birth, that they resided in Rome, and that they lived during the first century B.C.

THE VENUS OF SYRACUSE.

104. A marble statue, of which the head and the right arm are wanting, found in 1804 in a garden near the city of Syracuse; at present in the museum of that city. The slight projection on the breast shows where the right arm was placed. The fresh and lively forms of this statue indicate a work of Greek art, and a work closely allied to the fully developed Venus type of the best periods of art; but the drapery betrays a seeking after effect, a sure indication of a later period. Regarded from a technical point of view, the windy character of the garments is most admirable; and equally admirable the manner in which the drapery serves as a background for the living flesh of the legs. But this excellence is an incident and has no connection with the motive or with the character of the figure. The statue is, therefore, to be numbered with those statues where the expression of the divine is no longer the motive, but where divinity is used for the exhibition of grace and beauty of form. The beginnings of this tendency can be recognized in the works of Praxiteles, to whose school of art this statue could without injustice be assigned.¹

VENUS OF KALLIPYGOS.

105. A marble statue taken with the Farnese collection from Rome to Naples. The head, neck, and all of the breast above the edge of the garment, are modern.

¹ Two ends of the drapery come together in front of the centre of the person and are there held by the left hand. The rest of the drapery flies back as if the figure were or had been moving swiftly through the air. Drapery so arranged occurs on any number of Venus statues. Sometimes it is held by one hand, sometimes by the other; sometimes the two ends are tied and not held at all, as when the goddess is represented at her toilet for instance. The nude of the statue is most beautiful, and worthy of the very best periods of Greek art. No more delightful modelling has been rescued from antiquity. If of later art, later art is still misunderstood.

The right hand, the left arm, the left hand, with the piece of drapery it holds, and the right leg from the knee down, are also restorations. The restorations were done by Albaccini, on Canova's refusing to place anything of his own on so excellent a masterpiece. The goddess is represented as pulling her garments away from her person with especial intent to conspicuously disclose those parts which her name Kallipygos designates. The left arm pulls the skirt of the garment up over the left shoulder; the right hand moves the front of the skirt off to the left disclosing all the front of the person with the exception of the outward side of the left leg. The right breast is also bare. The goddess turns her head over her right shoulder as if to direct the glance of the beholder to the part of which she is particularly proud. There was in Syracuse a shrine consecrated to Venus Kallipygos, said to have been erected by two young women of poor but honest parentage who obtained wealthy husbands by a liberal display of those parts of their persons to which this statue calls attention. Both the motive and the story of the statue are repulsive. Still the difference between Greek and modern methods of thought must be taken into consideration. Moral views were often sacrificed in moments of æsthetic enthusiasm. Handsome men were worshipped after death simply because they had been handsome. Phryne showed herself nude to the Athenian populace as Venus Anadyomene knowing that she would be praised and not blamed for the act.

In spite of the great beauty of the antique parts the statue cannot be referred to the best period of Greek art; for no nude statues of the best periods show such unwomanly shamelessness. The statue is a product of the later Attic school of which the works, though they show great technical excellence, are destitute of moral character.¹

¹Carlo Albaccini, or Albagini, was a celebrated Roman sculptor of the early part of the present century. The Venus Kallipygos is the most extreme of all the sensual statues of the goddess. It so

[The Venus statues already described are the most celebrated ones so far recovered from antiquity. There are torsos and other statues innumerable in the various museums of Europe, and there are other types than those already mentioned. A very frequent type is the Venus Genetrix, of which perhaps the best example is in the Louvre. In this type the goddess appears in a long and diaphanous garment which has neither sleeves nor girdle. It falls from the left shoulder and reveals the left breast. With the left hand she holds up back of her an end of her garments, while in the outstretched right is generally an apple. The name comes from the selection of this type by the Julian family to symbolize their descent from the goddess. There are Venuses in every possible act and attitude of the bath and the toilet. A Venus in the Vatican has her garments tied about her waist while arranging her hair. There are actually Venuses who are in the act of wiping themselves dry. Such works differ in no particular from the productions of modern French art where direct appeal to the senses is the object and where the thin veil of art is easily pierced. Among the many Venus torsos, two are particularly deserving of mention; one is in the Naples Museum, the other in the British Museum. In the Naples torso the head, the entire left arm, the right forearm, and the legs from the knees down, are wanting. Along the left hip there is a bit of falling drapery. Friederichs' idea is that the goddess had opened wide her garments and was in the act of throwing them off behind her. The artist's object was to excite desire by conveying the idea of the first instant of display. The forms of this torso are most beautiful, maidenly, and virginal. One is made to think how the Venus of Milo must have looked when she was about

nearly approaches the boundaries of decency that it is quite a question if its public exhibition be not a public nuisance. I should certainly shut it up in the cabinet devoted to specimens of pornographic art discovered at Pompeii. If the origin of the statue as given by Friederichs be the true one, what an idea is presented of Syracuse society! (Athenæus Deipnosoph., No. XII, ch. lxxx.)

seventeen. The statue is remarkable for representing a period of life that is rarely touched by Greek artists ; that is, the transitional period between youth and maturity ; a period which until the advent of the modern Italian school was supposed to be sacred from even artistic intrusion. Yet the workmanship is so admirable that Friederichs does not hesitate to refer the torso to the best period of Greek art. The other torso is a little gem purchased for the British Museum from Cavaceppi, a renowned Roman sculptor. The head, the entire left arm, the legs from the knees down, and the right arm from half way between elbow and wrists, are wanting. The torso in its present condition is but little over a foot high, yet more beautiful lines and modelling cannot be found in the whole realm of art. The nude body is very much bent over to the right. The goddess is supposed to be loosening one of her sandals, the last one ; the artist's idea being by one shoe to appeal to desire satiated by the display of the absolutely nude. I state my opinions of these works very plainly ; for nothing is gained to art or to morals by ignoring their true character or by pretending not to perceive it. — *Ed.*]

LEDA AND THE SWAN.

106. [A relief in the new museum at Athens. Leda stands in a stooping attitude with her hands between her thighs. She is entirely nude with the exception of drapery which falls to the ground from between her knees. Her head is held down by the beak of a monstrous swan which clasps her thighs with his talons and is about enfolding her in his enormous outspread wings. The action of the swan is as if it had just fastened itself upon the maiden with whom resistance is at an end. The tail of the mighty bird causes Leda's drapery to project behind from between her legs. Her attitude displays beauty of outline ; and though the relief has been very much injured it can still be seen that the forms of the damsel are of great delicacy and grace. The contrast between the terrifying bird and the gentle

Leda is strongly and artistically presented. The conception of the subject is offensive to modern thought.

A repetition of this relief is in the library of the British Museum. The two may be copies from some celebrated original.

The scene is similarly rendered in a relief in the library attached to St. Mark's in Venice, and also in a relief in the Wolf collection in Rome. In the Venice group Leda still holds up her head, and with her right hand pushes back the neck of the swan. In the Wolf relief some variety in the background is introduced, and a little Cupid is assisting the swan with a push. In works of an earlier and a better period Leda is represented as receiving the swan to her bosom, and as shielding it from a pursuing eagle. In this type Leda is draped with the exception of the right side. She receives the swan with the right hand and, with the left, holds up her mantle to protect it. She looks upwards as if at the pursuing eagle. The swan is very small and the sensuality of the scene is completely avoided. Specimens of the type are in the Villa Borghese, in the Capitol, at Madrid, and elsewhere. In other representations sensuality is slightly admitted. In fact the evolution of sensuality in the scene can be traced all along through a number of works. See Jahn's *Archäologische Beiträge*, p. 1, ff. — *Ed.*]

CUPID WITH THE BOW OF HERCULES.

107. Cupid bracing one end of a bow against his right leg holds the centre of it in his left hand while the right hand is stretched out to the other end of the bow.

A marble statue in the Capitol at Rome. The legs, the arms, and the bow, are modern. The original action of the statue is not entirely certain; for though there are many repetitions they are all very much restored. Still with the help of gems and of those of the statues which are the least restored the correct restoration and the original motive of the work may be ascertained with a rea-

sonable degree of certainty. On a gem of the Berlin collection where the scene is given and which is entire, Cupid is spanning his bow and spanning it precisely as bows are spanned nowadays. The string which is shorter than the bow is fastened at one end of it and is looped about it towards the other end. The string is shorter than the bow in order that when the two ends are held by it the bow will be properly spanned. To span, the end to which the string is fastened is braced against the foot or the side of the leg, the left hand holds stoutly the centre of the bow, while the right hand bending the other end of the bow down with the palm moves the loop along with the fingers till it reaches the notch and is held by it. It will be readily understood that to span a heavy bow requires both strength and skill, and Cupid is apparently making quite an effort in the matter. The question suggests itself whether Cupid is spanning his own bow or the bow of some larger and stronger personage. The question is apparently answered by some of the other statues where on the support appears the lion's skin attributed to Hercules while against it rests his club. The supposition that the bow is the bow of the strongest of heroes adds to the interest of the statue and connects it with numerous other representations of similar import. The piquant contrast between the little love god as the victor and the mightiest of the mighty as the conquered is a favorite theme of later art and is endlessly varied. Sometimes the little god appears clothed with the lion's skin and wielding with ease the massive club of the hero. On one of the most excellent of antique gems Hercules, who bore with ease the burden of Atlas, is represented as hardly able to carry the little god on his shoulders.

The original statue has been attributed to both Lysippus and Praxiteles ; but with as little reason to one as to the other. The statues of the gods executed by these artists were temple-statues and were for purposes of worship ; a purpose for which so sportive a motive as is here illustrated could hardly have been selected.

It is as difficult to fix the period of the statue as it is to fix the name of the artist who executed it. If a parallel may be drawn with literature the statue may be a product of the Alexandrian period when literature was fond of wit and displayed itself in epigrams. But it may equally well be assigned to the time of the Roman emperors. It cannot belong to the best period of Greek art; for the motive is too piquant and too much involved for early sculpture. The best of classic art represented Cupid as a more dignified divinity and would not have attracted attention to the weakness, but to the strength, of Hercules.

Lysippus may have been the first artist of distinction to depart from the laws of severity and dignity; for he is reported to have executed a statue of Hercules robbed of his weapons by Cupid. A technical point against the very early origin of the statue is its perfect naturalness and freedom of action. All early statues, even genre statues, have a certain restraint. Here there is not a trace of it.¹

CENTAUR AND CUPID.

108. A marble group found during the 17th century in the Villa Fonseca at Rome. It formed part of the Borghese collection; in 1808 it was removed to Paris and is now in the Louvre. The group represents a centaur with his hands tied behind him turning his head to look at

¹ The very large number of the repetitions certainly points to a very celebrated original, and the original to be so celebrated must have been far more excellent and attractive than any of the existing copies. To the ordinary observer the motive is strained and far from beautiful. Of all the copies I have examined the small copy in the British Museum is the most suggestive of originally existing beauty. There are, I believe, about fifteen copies in the various public and private galleries of Europe. Friederichs cannot be sustained in his statement that the statues of the gods executed by early artists were exclusively for temple worship. The ideas held twenty odd years ago on the subject are being materially changed, and critics nowadays are inclined to believe that the earliest of Greek art was not reserved for religion but illustrated and adorned all of life, and that the earliest Greeks appreciated and enjoyed the playful and sportive side of their religion.

a little Cupid who is seated on his back and is apparently his captor. The wings, the feet, and the arms of the Cupid, are restorations. The support under the centaur is also substantially new. This group belonged to a larger group of which the other half is wanting but which the imagination can supply from extant copies. While this captured centaur turns his head to see who it is who has so suddenly mastered him, and the little god peers with sportive and defiant look, another and a younger centaur who is still rejoicing in full liberty approaches to inquire into the cause of his companion's discomfiture, not perceiving that another little mischief-making god has perched himself upon his own back and that he too will soon be a captive.

Early art represents centaurs as wild, brutish beings; as fighters, and as abductors of women. Here they are more passive than active. The connection of the roguish little god with the wild race of centaurs accords with the character of the poetry of the Alexandrian period which delights in accounts of Cupid's boyish pranks. The group may well go back to the time of Alexander, but not earlier. There are many partial copies of the group in existence, and the whole composition appears depicted on articles recovered from Pompeii. The little Cupid sways his arms as if keeping his balance. This may be the right restoration; or, as the position of the centaur's head seems to indicate, Cupid may have seized him by the hair. Perhaps this latter motive would make the discomfiture of the centaur more comic, and the whole scene more lively. The band about the Cupid's body is the quiver band.¹

¹ There are numbers of compositions in which the youthful and sportive character of Cupid is the theme. Friederichs would refer them all to the time of Alexander. Cupid is not one of the early divinities, but the spirit of these compositions is the same as the spirit of the Homeric hymns. If of the Alexandrian period, then there were artists living at the time who had kept alive in their hearts that playfulness and happy joyousness which are the earliest, best and most engaging qualities of Greek intellect.

CUPID AND PSYCHE.

109. [There are many examples of this celebrated group. The best one is in the museum of the Capitol at Rome. It was found on the Aventine about 1740 and was placed in the Capitol in 1749. Cupid and Psyche are represented standing together with their feet somewhat to the front but with their faces and the upper parts of their bodies turned towards one another. With his two hands Cupid draws Psyche's face close to his own for a kiss while Psyche's arms are about his body and seem to express a still greater tenderness. In many of the repetitions Cupid has wings. Here there are no wings, from which it has been inferred that this copy may have been made to decorate the tomb of two children. The original was undoubtedly winged and represented not so much mutual love as the intense devotion and full surrender of Psyche to her lover; for her action is far more passionate than his. Cupid is entirely nude; Psyche is draped from the hips down. The most admirable characteristic of the group is the skill displayed by the artist in avoiding sensualism. This is partially the result of the attitude which is singularly pure, and is partially owing to the forms which are very youthful. Still the artist's nature must have been very refined to conceive the subject so purely. The idyllic character of the composition, in the opinion of Friederichs, refers it to the time of Alexander.

Repetitions without wings are at Dresden and in the Hope collection of England. One with wings is also in Dresden. It is difficult to refer this most pure and most charming work to the same school, to the same period, or to the same race that produced and tolerated the Venus Kallypygos. No kiss in modern or ancient art is so ideal as the one that is being here enjoyed. The school and the period of the group cannot yet be fixed. The Hope and the Dresden copies are only about half size. — *Ed.*]

THE CAPUA PSYCHE FRAGMENT.

110. A marble fragment found in the amphitheatre of Capua at the same time that the Venus of Capua was discovered ; now in the Naples Museum. The fragment consists of the head, the bust and shoulders, and a triangular part of the right side reaching down to below the navel. The top and back of the head, and the stumps of the arms, are cut off smoothly, showing that at some time in the past the torso was made ready for the restorer. A bit of the left arm has been attached, and the nude from the shoulders down has been gone over with the chisel in a way to do great injury. The breasts, especially the right one, have been deprived of a portion of their rotundity.

The name Psyche has been given to this fragment, partially on account of the melancholy expression, and partially on account of the existence of a depression in the right shoulder where one of the wings may have been inserted. It is supposed that Psyche was represented in an attitude of melancholy and with her hands tied behind her ; so she appears on many gems. The apparent direction of the arms and the little of the drapery that has been preserved do not, however, sustain this idea. The figure, moreover, is too earnest and too mature for Psyche ; for in most works of art the legend is presented as a youthful episode, and no attempt is made to excite the deeper emotions. Another supposition advanced is that the figure is not Psyche but a winged Venus, though no explanation is offered why Venus should be winged.

This fragment was at first regarded as a work of the best period and was even attributed to Praxiteles. The place where it was found would indicate, however, that it was a work of a decorative character, and the superficial execution of the head points to a late period of art even though the work be a copy of some celebrated original.¹

¹ This fragment is one of the still existing mysteries of the history of

GANYMEDE.

111. [There are in the various museums of Europe many statues of Ganymede. They are variously composed, and present various degrees of excellence. Critics refer the majority of the types from which they are derived to the Alexandrian period, though there is no satisfactory reason for this opinion. A statue in the Vatican represents Ganymede as a mere boy. His right leg is stretched out; his left knee rests on a rock; the eagle with outstretched wings is behind him. Ganymede caresses the eagle's head with his right hand and grasps his wing with his outstretched left. There is no expression of fear; but the boy leaves the lizard and the turtle with which he may have been playing and prefers the eagle as a playmate. The composition is attractive, and the antique parts of the group are meritorious. A very common type presents Ganymede standing by the side of the eagle and passing his arm about the bird's neck. In this type the eagle is generally placed on a stump so as to bring his head nearer to a level with Ganymede's arm. Of this type there are specimens in Naples, in Florence, and in Berlin. The Berlin statue, perhaps the best in technique, has been differently restored, though it evidently belongs to the same type. Another type presents Ganymede as the eagle's cup-bearer. None of these statues are of sufficient excellence to repay study, nor have they secured a fixed place in the history of Greek sculpture. The composition is generally pleasing, and the types may have originated during the best art periods. Knowledge of

Greek sculpture. Its impressive beauty is so great that it cannot be put aside with an idle supposition. It must be very nearly connected to some great original by some great artist. The features are too dignified for Psyche or even for Venus. If anything in art permitted the idea, I would suggest that Juno was represented utterly abashed and humiliated at having revealed her person in vain to the shepherd of Mt. Ida. In spite of the treatment the fragment has received, there are few works of classic art that can compare with it in lofty and dignified beauty. It is one of the gems of the Naples collection.

Greek art is still too incomplete for an opinion to be valuable. Many of these works are quite as attractive as the one assigned by critics to Leochares. — *Ed.*]

THE SO-CALLED GANYMEDE OF THE UFFIZI IN FLORENCE.

112. A little figure about three feet high restored as Ganymede with the eagle and a cup at its feet. The statue was found at Palestrina early in the sixteenth century and was presented to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. The restorations were effected by Benvenuto Cellini.

The statue is not without value in itself, but is especially interesting as evidence of the naïve manner in which at the time of Benvenuto Cellini the remains of antiquity were treated. This is the statue of which Cellini speaks in his autobiography and which led to one of his difficulties with Bandinelli. How he happened to undertake the restoration, he described as follows: "One Sunday after dinner I went to the palace, and when I got to the cloak-room I perceived that the door to the guard-chamber was open, and as I drew near the Grand Duke cried out to me in very friendly manner: "You are welcome. Look at this box which Signore Stefano of Palestrina has sent me as a present. Open it and let us see what is in it." As soon as I had opened it and had seen what was in it, I said to the Duke: "My Lord, it is a Greek marble, and a most marvellous one. Among all the marbles of antiquity which represent youth, I know of nothing that surpasses it. So that I offer to your most Illustrious Excellency to restore the head, the arms, and the legs; and to add an eagle that it shall appear and be baptized as a Ganymede," And so it was done. In those days and at the present time too fragments are restored without much expenditure of thought.

It is unnecessary to add that the restoration is not only arbitrary but destitute of style. Even Goethe called it mannered. There is no way, however, of ascertaining

what restoration would be correct, and Cellini's idea may as well be accepted as any other.¹

THE THREE GRACES.

113. [The well-known type of the three Graces is probably to be referred to this period of Greek art history. The type presents the three nude and standing with their arms upon one another's shoulders. The centre one has her back to the spectator while the outer

¹ The antique parts of this statue are graceful and delicate, and the restorations by Benvenuto Cellini display the fine skill for which he was famed. The statue was in all probability an Apollo and certainly belonged to a good period of Greek art. Benvenuto's autobiography is entertaining throughout, and gives a lively picture of the state of society at the time and of the position held by the fine arts in public estimation. The altercation between Benvenuto and Bandinelli in the presence of the Duke is very amusing. Benvenuto's description of Bandinelli's group of Hercules and Cacus is not very much of an exaggeration. Thomas Nugent's translation of it is as follows: "If the hair of your Hercules were shaved off there would not remain skull enough to hold his brains. With regard to his face, it is hard to distinguish whether it is the face of a man or of a creature somewhat between a lion and an ox. It shows no attention to what it is about, and it is so badly set upon the neck, with so little art and so ungraceful a manner, that a more shocking piece of work was never seen. His great brawny back resembles the two pommels of an ass's pack saddle. His breast and their muscles bear no similitude to those of a man but appear like a sack of melons against a wall. The small of the back has the appearance of a bag filled with long cucumbers. It is impossible to conceive in what manner the two legs are fastened to this distorted figure; for it is hard to distinguish upon which leg he stands, or upon which he exerts any effort of his strength; nor does he appear to stand upon both, as he is sometimes represented by those masters of the art of statuary who know something of their business. It is plain too that the statue inclines more than one-third of a cubic forward, and this is the greatest and most insupportable blunder which pretenders to sculpture are guilty of. As for the arms, they both hang down in the most awkward and ungraceful manner, and so little art is displayed in them, that people would be almost tempted to think you never saw a naked man in your life. The right leg and that of Cacus touch at the middle of their calves, and if they were to be separated, not one of them only, but both, would remain without a calf in the place where they touch; besides, one of Hercules' feet is quite buried and the other seems to have fire under it." Such straight out and emphatic criticism would be of service now-a-days, especially in this country.

figures face to the front. The best example of the type is said to be in the Vatican, but the public is not allowed to see it. A very much damaged example is in a building attached to the cathedral of Sienna ("Opera del Duomo"). The head, arms, and the left leg of the central figure, are wanting; also the outer arms of the other figures; the entire group is also very much bruised and battered. There is another example in the Louvre in Paris. The original of the type must have been of very great beauty. Ever since these and other similar groups were discovered artists have delighted to reproduce the type. The graces of Raphael, Canova, and Thorwaldsen, are even better known than the antiques from which they are derived.

The Sienna group was found in Rome in 1503 during the pontificate of Pius III, and was presented by him to the cathedral library. It was removed to its present location in 1857 at the request of Pius IX. The Vatican group, according to Clarac's drawing (Musée. pl. 632, 1427) is, like the Louvre group, terminated at each end by a vase covered with drapery. The central figure, the one that has its back to the spectator, has her arms in front of the other figures; the left hand rests upon the right shoulder of the figure to the left and the right hand reaches towards some fruit and flowers held in the left hand of the figure on the right. So much has been restored, however, that the original action can only be conjectured. In the castle of Hegel near Berlin belonging to the Humboldt family is a torso of the greatest beauty corresponding to the central figure of the group. The modelling is so exquisite as to be worthy of the school of Praxiteles, though the graces can hardly have been represented nude so early as the days of that artist (Pau. ix, 35-7). This group and the group of Cupid and Psyche already described point to a school of art existing somewhere, and about the time of Alexander, where conceptions were pure and forms were rendered more gently and delicately than ever before or after in antiquity. The

grand and the dignified are entirely absent, but the school does not show a trace of sensuality. It is felt, however, that the very next step must be towards the sensual, and that perhaps the absence of the sensual is owing to the absence of character. — *Ed.*]

HERMAPHRODITE.¹

114. Statues in which a union of the two sexes is represented are not infrequent in the museums of Europe, and are referred by criticism to various art periods. Pliny (N. H., 34, 80) mentions that Polycles executed a statue of an Hermaphrodite ("Hermaphroditem nobilem fecit"), but does not state whether it was the earlier or the later Polycles. Still the passage shows that the subject was selected early in the history of art. Of the various types in existence the most famous is that where the double personage is represented almost entirely nude and in an amorous dream. There are four well known examples, of which the one in the Louvre is by far the most excellent in point of execution; others are in the Borghese Villa at Rome, at Florence, and at the museum of the Hermitage in St. Petersburg.

The existence of these statues is only mentioned in this work in order to indicate sources of information to those desiring it. Whatever may be the capacities of other languages, or the ability of other writers, I know no way of accurately describing these statues in the English language that would not offend. If they are indications of the degeneracy into which Greece had fallen before the Roman conquest, the Roman conquest came none too soon.

¹ Friederichs' Bausteine, 614, 615.

Visconti, Monumenti scelti Borghesiani, pl. 14, pp. 112-119.

Winckelmann, l., 136 (Stuttgart edition of complete works, 1847), and others referred to by Fröhner in his catalogue of the Louvre under the head of the Hermaphrodites.

THE FARNESE FLORA.

115. A colossal marble statue found in the ruins of the baths of Caracalla during the excavations made by Paul III. It stood in the Farnese palace in Rome until 1790, when with the rest of the Farnese collection it was removed to Naples. It is now in the Naples Museum. When found the head, the forearms and the feet, were wanting. The statue was restored as Flora, first by Guglielmo della Porta; his restorations were subsequently removed and the present ones substituted in 1796 by two artists, Filippo Tagliolini and Carlo Albaccini. The former devoted himself to the head, the latter to the extremities. The figure is clothed with the chiton, girded in a singular manner some distance below the navel, it also falls so as to expose a portion of the right shoulder. The right hand holds up the garments on the right side, disclosing the feet and conveying the idea that a dance may be about commencing. From the left shoulder a mantle passes about the left arm and falls by the side of the left leg to below the left knee. The restorer has also placed flowers in the left hand.

Wincklemann thought the statue was a muse, and from the attitude of dance he concluded that it was either Erato or Terpsichore. In another passage he calls the statue one of the Hours. Against the idea of a muse is the transparent character of the drapery. Such drapery would do well for a Venus or a bacchante, but would not be appropriate to a muse. Another idea is that the statue is dance personified. But if the action of the right hand be studied carefully and in connection with the pose of the body, it will be seen that the figure is not so much dancing as moving forward in slow and graceful measure. The colossal size of the figure is also against the notion; for personifications are more generally within than beyond the dimensions of life. Another idea is that the figure was grouped with the Farnese Hercules and represented

Hebe offering nectar to the tired hero. In that case a cup instead of flowers must be supposed in the left hand. The size of the statue is, however, an insuperable objection to this idea; for to be grouped with the Hercules a much smaller Hebe would be required. Attention has also been called to the great resemblance of this figure to archaic figures of Venus; not in style, but in the composition. The archaic Venus held her dress in the right hand, and in her left held a flower. The Romans called the type *Spes*. The type has been made use of by the modern sculptor Thorwaldsen. Instances of such utilizing, or modernizing, of old types occur even in Greek sculpture. The figure may well be the archaic Venus adapted to the tastes of a later period; still the name *Flora* seems appropriate. The statue is an admirable proof of the possibility of combining grace with size. There is an intentional display of carelessness in the low girdling and in the exposure of the left shoulder; nor is the statue free from a certain refined sensuality. Greek art, at least in its bloom, was too modest for such diaphanous drapery: a drapery suggestive of the taste which rules in paintings from Herculaneum and Pompeii.

That the figure was not made at the time of Caracalla needs no proof. It is either a work of the best Roman period or of the last century of Greek art.¹

THE YOUTHFUL BACCHUS OF THE CAPITOL.

116. Bacchus as a fat and naked baby is seated on a little altar and plays with the mask of an old Silenus which he holds up above his head. The altar is covered with the *nebris*, over which is some drapery.

¹ I do not know the exact height of this statue. Clarac gives it as thirteen palms, about eleven feet. It is by far the most beautiful of all colossal antique statues. In no ancient statue is there more admirable treatment of drapery; not only the flesh, but the special quality of the flesh, seems to shine through it. The elasticity, the grace and the suppleness of form are worthy of the best art periods. The modern and very ugly head should be removed; for it detracts from the impression.

Children, or Cupids, playing with masks and sticking their little heads through them to frighten their companions are frequently represented on ancient monuments. Of all such representations this one is the most excellent. It belongs to a period when artists did not hesitate to sport with divinity; but it proves that it was a period when artists were possessed of the highest ability. In character, in attitude, and in action, this little figure is most admirable. The elasticity of the baby forms is most truthfully rendered.¹

THE YOUTHFUL BACCHUS.

117. [A number of statues in the museums of Europe representing an adolescent Bacchus in about the same attitude seem to point to one original; an original probably of the Alexandrian period, though it may be earlier. Of them all, one in the Louvre (No. 216 of Fröhner's catalogue of 1869) seems to be the nearest to the original, if not the original itself. Fröhner describes it as follows:

"The young god is represented nearly nude, with his head crowned with ivy; a nebris, attached to the left shoulder falls in folds over the breast. The left arm probably rested on a grape-vine, while the right arm was elevated and may have rested on the head. The lemnisques, which were in metal and reached down to the middle of the breast, have been torn away; but the holes where they were fixed are still to be seen, seven on the right side and five on the right shoulder. It is evident that this magnificent statue was part of a group that faced to the front; for the back, including the back of the hair, is only blocked out.

"In one of the pediments of the temple of Delphi were statues of Bacchus and the Thyades by Praxias and

¹ There was no period of Greek history in which the sportive spirit did not exist. From the time of the Homeric hymns down an expression of sportiveness is of no assistance in determining the date of a work of art.

Androstenes, Athenians and contemporaries of Phidias. This statement and the grand forms of the statue, which recall the school of Phidias, permit the supposition that it may be an original of the best period of Greek art." The oftener the statue is seen the more one is disposed to believe that Fröhner's supposition is correct, and that the statues which Friederichs and others assign to the Alexandrian period are modified and mollified copies of this original. Of the copies in which the gentler, softer, and more effeminate characteristics of the god are made prominent, one in the Louvre and one in Madrid are especially excellent. In the Louvre example the god rests his left elbow on the stump of a tree about which a vine is entwined. The statue is of excellent execution. The dreamy half conscious condition of approaching inebriety is admirably rendered. The nebris goes like a scarf from the left shoulder and around the right hip. The head, bound with a fillet, is crowned with ivy. As the leaves of the ivy resemble those of the vine, ivy became sacred to the god of the vine. This statue is known as the Bacchus of Versailles from its having so long adorned the palace of Versailles (No. 218, in Fröhner's catalogue). In the Madrid example the god rests his arm on a Hermes of the early bearded Bacchus. He is entirely nude and the right hand instead of resting on the head has been restored to hold a bunch of grapes. Here forms are very delicate, but very effeminate. Intoxication is perhaps a little nearer than in any of the other examples. A statue in the Vatican belongs to the same type. The antique parts of it are most highly praised by Visconti (Museo Pio Clementino, 2, 182). His lively and enthusiastic description is too long to be transcribed, but should be read. — *Ed.*]

THE CAPITOLINE BACCHUS HEAD.

118. A marble bust in the Capitol at Rome. The tip of the nose, the upper lip, and the bust, are modern.

The head is gently bowed and turns slightly to the right. The hair is parted in the middle, is thick and curly, falls to the neck on either side, and is bound about with a fillet. The expression is that of a person sunk in a deep and sweet reverie. In no other head of Bacchus is this dream-like character so strongly and so beautifully portrayed. The excellence of the work has led to its being assigned to the school of Phidias. It indeed resembles Bacchus types which are referred to the time of the great master. A doubt has been expressed whether the head be not female and the head of Ariadne, on account of the resemblance of the face to the face of the sleeping Ariadne of the Vatican. The face, however, is rather too full for that of a woman ; and the falling locks are so characteristic of Bacchus as to leave but little doubt of its identity.

THE SLEEPING ARIADNE OF THE VATICAN.

119. A marble statue in the Louvre since the time of Julius II. The nose, the upper lip, two fingers of the left hand, and the right hand, are restorations.

Before Winckelmann's time, when Greek art was regarded from the point of view of Roman history, the statue was known as Cleopatra, and the bracelet about the left arm which resembles a snake was mistaken for a snake. There can no longer be any doubt as to the person represented. Ariadne's sleep is not quiet or peaceful ; as is indicated by the attitude, the loosened brooch, and by the disorder of the drapery. Ariadne is disturbed by uneasy dreams. The eventful sleep on the island of Naxos is represented, during which Theseus deserted her and Bacchus discovered her. The pathetic idea of unrest is partially produced by the uneven surface upon which the artist has placed the figure. The surface is lower in the centre, so that the body is slightly drawn together. To make the idea clearer by contrast let the statue be compared with Rauch's celebrated statue of the sleeping

Queen Louise, where peaceful and happy sleep is so wonderfully represented. This touching agitation, as well as the absence of all symbolism, prevent the statue's being regarded as a sleeping nymph. There are, moreover, copies and derivatives of this figure where accessories clearly indicate Ariadne.

It is interesting to compare the statue with the many repetitions which appear in mural paintings and on sarcophagi of the Roman period. These differ from it, especially in the features. There they are weak and sensual; here they are grand and imposing. This statue is faithful to the original; other representations have yielded to an effeminate taste. That it is a copy is very apparent. Winckelmann called attention to the fact that the face is crooked. Another defect betraying the copyist is in the drapery back of the feet, where the upper and the lower garment so run together that they cannot be distinguished. This fault would not appear if the statue were placed against a wall; and as the back part is unfinished, the original position of this particular copy must have been against a wall. The original was undoubtedly of Greek workmanship. Mention is made of an Athenian picture of the sleeping Ariadne and the faithless Theseus (Pau. 1-20). Their history furnished favorite subjects for artists. Whether the original was alone, or grouped, can only be conjectured. Perhaps Bacchus and his companions were approaching as Theseus retired. This particular figure was probably not grouped; for if placed against a wall it is difficult to conceive of a group that would harmonize with it. The pathetic character of the statue prevents its being assigned to an earlier period than the middle of the fourth century.

The idea has been advanced that the statue may have served as a funereal monument to a person who is here portrayed as Ariadne. On Roman sarcophagi the figure is so used, the features being made to resemble those of the deceased. It is a question, however, whether an uneasy sleep would be appropriate; nor is Bacchus pres-

ent, as generally on sarcophagi, to awaken Ariadne to her blessed future.¹

THE DRESDEN FORSAKEN ARIADNE.

120. A marble statue belonging to the Chigi collection which was secured for Dresden in 1728. The right breast, the right arm, and the left hand, are restorations. The head was broken off and reset improperly. It turns too much to the left and looks too much upwards. Whether originally the left hand hung down, and whether it held an object, can only be conjectured.² The figure

¹ There is in the Royal Gallery of Madrid a statue which so nearly resembles the Vatican statue that the two must have been derived from the same original. In the Madrid statue the head is far less elevated, being but a little higher than the knees. As all the rock bed on which the Vatican statue rests is modern, the statue may originally have been more recumbent. A more recumbent attitude would certainly be more natural, and at the same time more artistic. In the Berlin Museum there are two casts of the Vatican statue; one in the Vatican attitude, the other in the attitude suggested by the Madrid statue. The superiority of the latter is very apparent. In the Madrid statue the veil that is about the head and which crosses the person of the vatican statue does not appear. One notion is that the original was more simply draped, and that the wonderful folds and intricacies of the Vatican statue are entirely the work of the copyist. The Madrid copy is a poor work, and is only interesting on account of its suggestiveness. The curious may puzzle themselves with trying to follow out to their end the many and perplexing folds of the Vatican statue. Apart from the drapery, the grand forms and the noble proportions make it one of the most interesting and one of the most excellent statues of antiquity. It was purchased by Julius II of Girolamo Maffei. The price is said to have been four hundred ducats a year for four years. At first it decorated a fount in one of the corridors of the palace. It is probable that while ornamenting the fountain the false level was given to it. Though this particular figure may not have been grouped, the original undoubtedly was. There are so many bas-reliefs, coins, mosaics, and mural paintings, where a very similar figure is grouped with Bacchus, Satyrs, and Cupids, that a group is to be presupposed in which Bacchus is discovering the forsaken Ariadne. See Jahn. *Archæologische Beiträge*, p. 298.

² The upper part of the right side of the head, the nose, and the lips, are also modern. The left forearm has been restored from half way from the elbow. There is also a restoration in the upper part of the left arm. The pipe, or roll, or whatever it is in the left hand, was added on the supposition that the figure was a Muse. The statue is

probably represents the deserted Ariadne witnessing the departure of Theseus. This explanation is supported by a mosaic found at Salzburg and now in Laxenburg, a town not far from Vienna. The mosaic gives a series of pictures of which the subjects are taken from the history of Theseus and Ariadne, and in the series there is a representation of Ariadne that coincides almost exactly with this statue. The character of the work, moreover, is in harmony with this explanation. The position of the legs, which under other circumstances would be considered careless, is appropriate to one lost in thought. The partial nudity is expressive. It would not have been appropriate to the sleeping Ariadne of the Vatican, whose noble and pathetic character would have been injured by a show of charming form. To this gentle and elegiac statue it is of great advantage.

Ariadne in a similar attitude is frequently seen in ancient Roman mural paintings; but in them she is always invested with a certain amount of sentimentality; here, though sad, she is noble and masters her grief. The statue is not an original. Parts, the ears for instance, are carelessly finished and the right side of the mouth is too short. The head in spite of the faulty restorations is of great beauty, and the arrangement of the hair recalls some of the more attractive statues of Venus. The original must have been a Greek work of great merit, and of the post-Phidian period when the representation of sentiments and emotions attracted the artist's attention.¹

about life size. It represents a maiden seated on a rock and resting her right elbow on her right knee. The left leg is somewhat awkwardly stretched out. The figure is draped about the loins and legs. The drapery also goes about the left elbow.

¹ This statue is one of the most attractive statues of antiquity. The face is a fascinating study. It seems to express surprise, as if Ariadne were asking herself: "Can it be possible that I, Ariadne, am being deserted?" It is full of womanly pride, dignity and self-sufficiency. When the first shock of insult has passed, Theseus will be most satisfactorily despised and then properly forgotten. The artist was possessed of sentiments with which modern thought can sympa-

BACCHUS, FAUNS, ETC.

121. [The existing representations of Bacchus and of his followers, both male and female, of which the originals are with more or less show of reason assigned to this period are so generally uninteresting and uninteresting as works of art that but a few of them attract the art student. A very lovely type is that in which Bacchus as a child is carried on the shoulders of a faun. The playful and sportive character of this work is instructive when compared with the more solemn and serious statues of former periods where the youthful Bacchus is carried by an aged Silenus or by Mercury himself. A good example of the type is in the Naples Museum; a more attractive one in the Villa Albani even though the Albani group is the more restored of the two. In each group the faun is entirely nude and the child sits a-straddle on the back of his neck with his little legs hanging in front. A more secular and less divine attitude could hardly be imagined. In the Naples group the god has been restored holding a bunch of grapes in one hand and clasping the head of the faun with the other. The faun, who looks back and up to him with a happy smile, is playing on cymbals. In the Albani example the god holds a cup in his left hand and his right foot is held by the faun's right hand. Both restorations are arbitrary as the original action is unknown. In the Albani group, the arms of the faun from half way between the shoulders and the elbows, and his legs from the hips down, are modern.

thize. This is one of the first statues to be recommended to the collector of casts.

A colossal repetition is in the Giustiniani Palace in Rome; and there is said to be a copy in the Pisani Palace in Venice. Winckelmann mistook the statue for Agrippina, the mother of Nero. His lively description is a warning against allowing enthusiasm to outpace information and sound judgment. Clarac, Böttiger, and other writers, have called the statue a Niobe. In the Salzburg mosaic the feet cross one another, but with that exception there seems a full resemblance; that is, to judge from the drawing of the mosaic in George Friedrich Creuzer's *Symbolik*. I have not seen the mosaic.

Of Bacchus, the head and all of the right arm, part of the left arm, both feet, and parts of each leg, are also new. The restorations are of great beauty and are admirably in keeping. The Naples example is evidently much later and, consequently, though less restored is less valuable as a guide in determining the action of the original.

Another series of statues represents a faun with either a goat or a small panther by his side. There are so many of these statues and they are so differently conceived that they cannot be traced back to a limited number of pre-existing types. The fact that in most of them the faun is not entirely nude but wears the nebris has led some critics to assign them to an earlier period than the statues just described. A beautiful example is in the Villa Albani. A faun standing against the trunk of a tree on his left plays with a panther, attracting his attention by a bunch of grapes which he holds high up in his right hand in such a way, too, that the right arm goes over the head to the left and the upper part of the body turns in the same direction. The stretched out left hand holds the pædum. The end of the nebris falls over the left arm forming a hollow in which is fruit. The action is very graceful, and the execution of the modern parts is worthy of the antique.

Another type, and perhaps the best known of all, represents a young faun with the skin of some animal thrown about his shoulder leaning against a pedestal or the trunk of a tree and playing upon a flute or pipe. The type so nearly resembles the faun type attributed to Praxiteles that it has been assigned to the same school. Its Arcadian and idyllic character would, however, justify assigning it to a later period. Protogenes, the great painter of Rhodes and the rival of Apelles, is said to have painted a picture of a satyr playing on the flute and catching his breath between the notes. The motive of the statue may well be the same, and the statue itself borrowed from the great picture. The best example of the type is in the Louvre and originally belonged to the

Borghese collection. Pan teaching Apollo to play on the flute is a very well-known subject, and apparently belongs to this same period. In most of the extant examples of this type the subject is not free from vulgarity, and gives offence.

There is in the Villa Albani a small but quite extraordinary statue representing a youthful female satyr. The head has horns; a leopard's skin is tied over the left shoulder and in front of the hips so as to leave the front of the person bare down to the beginning of the goat's legs. The hands and the pipe on which the figure plays are modern. In spite of a certain charm the figure is repulsive. Friederichs calls it most lovely (*allerliebst*) and other authors are lavish of praise; but the combination of goat's legs with the budding forms of maidenhood is not attractive. One or two of the statues belonging to this series merit special mention. — *Ed.*]

THE BACCHANTE IN ECSTASY.

122. [A small bas-relief in the British Museum representing an infuriated bacchante. She moves to the left. Her right hand is held over her head and holds a knife. Her left arm is outstretched a little behind her person and holds the hind quarters of a kid which she is supposed to have just cut in two. Her figure is clothed in a long, loose, diaphanous, floating garment through which her whole figure is distinctly seen, and which leaves bare the right breast and all of the left breast, side, arm and shoulder. The agitated garments are most skilfully managed, and the workmanship throughout is of a very high order. The relief is but a foot and a half high and but ten inches wide. It probably formed one of the sides of a candelabrum. This same figure occurs on the celebrated Venus altar in the Chiaramonte Museum of the Vatican. On the principal side of the altar, which is about three feet high, is Venus between two raging bacchantes. The one on the right facing Venus is the

exact counterpart of the figure in the British Museum except that the restorer has completed the kid. On one of the other sides of the altar is another bacchante holding a section of a dismembered kid, but more clothed than this figure and in a different attitude. The great point of interest in the altar is that the figure of Venus is quite archaic. She is represented standing upright, somewhat stiff, fully clothed, girdled, carrying in the right hand the archaic flower, and in the left a long sceptre. The altar has been so much injured that the details can only with difficulty be made out. While the attitude, the forms, and the drapery of Venus, are archaic, in the bacchantes there reign the fulness and voluptuousness of late realism. As the relief is apparently of one time and of one artist, and as the marble is Greek and the workmanship early, the question very naturally presents itself, may not realism have been earlier developed than is usually supposed? If this be admitted, there will be less hesitancy in ascribing the type of these and of similar figures to the time of Scopas. See Callistratus, *Imagines*, 2. The altar and the frieze in the British Museum were both found by Galvin Hamilton amid the ruins of the ancient city Gabii. — *Ed.*]

THE LIBERA OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

123. [A marble statue about five feet high found by Gavin Hamilton in 1776 at a small place near Rome called Roma Vecchia. It belonged to the Towneley collection and passed with it into the British Museum. This is one of the most pleasing of all the representations of Libera, or the female Bacchus. The hands and forearms are apparently modern. The figure is clothed from head to foot with a double chiton which is confined by a band which passes over the right shoulder and under the left breast. This method of confining the drapery is picturesque and adds to the simplicity and beauty of the falling folds. Under the chiton is apparently another and

a more delicate garment. It appears about the right foot; at least English critics so account for the appearances about the foot. On the feet are sandals with very thick soles. By the side of the figure is a very small panther rampant. The restorer has added a stick which is held by the right hand and rests on the right shoulder; he has also placed a bunch of grapes in the left hand. The head is crowned with the vine, or with ivy leaves, and two stiff and somewhat archaic curls fall on each side of the neck.

In this statue *Libera* seems to be sufficiently distinguished from an ordinary *bacchante* on the one side and from *Ariadne* on the other; a distinction generally very difficult to make. Though the statue hardly merits the praise the English lavish upon it, it nevertheless points to an original of excellent conception and of a good period. — *Ed.*]

THE BARBERINI FAUN.

(From H. Brunn's catalogue of the Munich Glyptothek.)

124. A statue in Parian marble. H. 2, 15. Found during the pontificate of Urban VIII (1623–1644) in the moat of the castle of St. Angelo in Rome. It may have been one of the statues which were precipitated from the castle walls during the siege of Rome in 587. It belonged to the Barberini family until the beginning of the present century and was purchased in 1813 by Prince Louis of Bavaria. Ever since it has been one of the chief attractions of the Glyptothek. It was at first restored in a recumbent position. The present restoration, which dates from the beginning of the eighteenth century, was improved and completed at the beginning of the present century by Camillo Pacetti. The end of the nose, the left forearm, the right elbow, the fingers of the right hand, the whole of the right leg from the flank, a section of the left thigh, a part of the left shin, and the front part of the left foot including the toes, are modern.

The statue represents a vigorous young satyr stretched out on a rock and deeply sunken in a drunken sleep. He reclines to the left; his head rests on his left shoulder; his right hand is about and above his head; his left arm hangs over the rock on which he rests, and his legs are widely spread out. The figure is entirely nude with the exception of one bit of the panther's skin on which the figure reposes which passes over the left shoulder. The legs are outstretched and the right hand is lifted in order to ease the labored breathing of intoxication. The left hand may originally have been turned in a little more and have held a cup. An abrasion on the rock, now filled up with plaster, may indicate where the cup was held.

Although the little tail is given and horns can be perceived beneath the ivy crown, it is evident that the artist proposed to identify the satyr by a showing of his inner nature. The details of the head are appropriately common. The nose turns in; the cheek-bones are prominent; the lips pout; the forehead is furrowed; the eyebrows are heavy, and the hair is bushy. No artist would have presumed to represent as overcome by wine any personage whose nature was not entirely sensual and who was not incapable of exciting intellectual or spiritual interest. The shut eyes seem to be still running over with moisture. The breath seems laboring through the mouth and hissing against the disclosed teeth. An attitude so opposed to the grace and the decorum of Greek art could only have been chosen to represent a bestial nature. But however realistic may be the work, both conception and execution are in full harmony with the nature of Greek art. The artist avoids making prominent offensive details, and uses them only so far as they are essential to his purpose of representing the very essence of a being who is entirely sensual.

The freshness and the liveliness of the conception, this poetizing of materialism, make it impossible to assign the statue to a Roman period. Even such works as the Laocoon show a greater degree of school-craft and of

methodized reflection. Here is a full show of the genius of originality. On the other hand, it is evident that so realistic a work could not have been conceived and executed until after the time of Praxiteles and Skopas; that is till, at least, the beginning of the third century B.C. The statue is most undoubtedly an original. On the right arm, and in some places on the back, there are evidences of carelessness; but the workmanship of the whole is so remarkably excellent that it seems that these parts must have been intentionally left unfinished in order to enhance the parts to which they were near and to which the artist wished to call especial attention. The antique part of the right arm, for instance, is a rough background for the head where the idea of the whole statue is concentrated, and where the artist would have the observer direct his keenest gaze.¹

THE DANCING SILENUS OF THE VILLA BORGHESE.

125. A marble statue found in 1824 about 12 miles south-west of Rome near Monte Caro. It was purchased by the Borghese family, and is now in the Villa Borghese in Rome. The arms are restored in plaster; also, a part of the left thigh and the greater part of the tree trunk with the skin that rests upon it. The statue represents a naked, bearded, tailed, and dancing faun. He is on his toes; his feet are not far apart; and in his movements he has so twisted himself that his legs cross. The restora-

¹ Brunn refers his readers to Clarac's *Musée*, pl. 720, n. 1723 for a representation of the first restoration. There, however, the figure reclines on the right side and all the limbs are reversed. Still it gives one an idea of what the first restoration may have been.

The statue is a most extraordinary creation. There is no work of ancient or of modern art that is so realistic without being far more offensive. It is the life-like representation of a naked young man fallen into a drunken stupor. A more disgusting spectacle can hardly be conceived; and yet offence is so slight, and the mind is so attracted away to the skill of the artist, that one may well suppose that his object was to please where nature disgusts and thus show the power of art over nature.

tions though conducted by Thorwaldsen, are hardly correct. The Silenus instead of striking cymbals should be playing double pipes. The cheeks are puffed out, and in the corners of the mouth there are apparently holes where the pipes were inserted. Additional proof is added by many reliefs where a similar figure is represented and always playing on pipes. The striking of cymbals would have been accompanied by a much more lively action of the figure. The gentle twisting about in a circle which is here indicated would be accompanied by other music than the music of cymbals.

The figure is not dancing a joyous dance, but seems to be endeavoring to produce an impression of sobriety and dignity. The twisting and turning of the figure seem to be in order to make a solemn impression; but the result does not correspond with expectations, for the impression is more comic than solemn. Some critics refer this statue to as far back as the time of Myron. A comparison of its head with the head of the Myron Silenus of the Lateran Museum should dispel the thought. In the Lateran statue rigid severity still controls; here the freest and the most disorderly realism prevails. Nor could this statue have been executed before the time when most careful anatomical studies were made. There is no affected display in the anatomical accuracy with which the figure turns and twists, for every motion is controlled by the fundamental conception. A profound study of anatomy, however, must be presupposed; and no such study could have been pursued before the time of Alexander.¹

¹ This statue is one of the most admirable anatomical studies that antiquity has, so far, furnished. It is, perhaps, the earliest statue in which correct anatomy is displayed in full action. There are earlier works in which no anatomical fault can be detected; that is, no glaring fault, but in them there is no call for an accurate knowledge of the science; here, however, in the strained limbs an error would have been flagrant, and accuracy is consequently most noticeable. The comic element to which Friederichs refers is not very perceptible. The dance was most assuredly a solemn, and a religious one, and one into which the artist would not have presumed to infuse the comic

THE FLAYING OF MARSYAS.

126. [There are many statues in the museums of Europe that point to the existence at some time of a famous group representing the flaying of Marsyas. The excellence of some of these statues is proof that the original work was Greek, and of a good art period. The subject is post-Alexandrian. The group contained at least three figures, Apollo, Marsyas, and a slave on his knees sharpening the flaying knife. There is no one figure of Apollo in existence that can be selected as pre-eminently fitted for the chief place in the group, though there are many statues which answer reasonably well the requirements of the conception. The god probably held his lyre, and contemplated the punishment with quiet and god like complacency. Of the Marsyas there are many examples. The best one is in the Louvre. The unfortunate satyr is represented tied and suspended by the hands to a pine tree awaiting the moment of his cruel punishment. The statue displays wonderful skill. The muscles of the arms which bear the weight of the body are swollen by the effort; the eyes and mouth are full of sorrow; the breast is distended by painful respiration; the legs hang down inert and powerless. Similar statues are in Rome, Florence, Berlin, St. Petersburg, and Athens. The far-famed knife-sharpener of Florence was undoubtedly a part of the composition or suggested by it. — *Ed.*]

THE KNIFE-SHARPENER OF FLORENCE (L'ARROTINO).

127. [This statue in the Cabinet of the Uffizi represents an element. Though the figure may not be referred to the time of Myron, it is suggestive of the Diskobolos of that artist. Though the artist was conscious of his knowledge of anatomy, he does not make a show of it. The figure must not therefore be associated with such figures as the Borghese gladiator where to display anatomy is the first object; for it is of a much earlier and nobler school. If works of nobler character were proportionately nobler in conception and execution, then the most excellent of Greek statues are still undiscovered.

sents a slave crouching for the purpose of sharpening a knife on a whetstone. He is apparently seated on the heel of his right leg which is bent under him. A coarse cloth hangs from the left shoulder down the back and partially in front. He looks up and slightly to the left with a very singular expression which is not sufficiently clear to be defined. It is hardly an expression of sympathy; nor is it altogether the expression of a person who is anticipating pleasure, nor of one who is jeering. Its indefiniteness may have been intentional to show more clearly a barbaric, inferior, and unsympathetic nature. This nature, however, seems sufficiently evidenced in the hair, the features, and in the hands. There are about the knuckles similar wrinkles to those seen on the so-called "Dying Gladiator" of the Capitol. The barbaric type is happily chosen, as in Athens the trade of cutlery was exercised by slaves.

When first discovered the statue was supposed to be the slave who disclosed to Cæsar the conspiracy of Achilles and Pothinus.

That such excellent workmanship should have been applied to a figure which of necessity is secondary and subordinate is evidence that the group was of surpassing merit. I know no author who gives the time or the place where the statue was found. Burckhardt in his "Cicerone" (515, a.) ventures the supposition that the statue is not antique, but a work of the time of Michael Angelo. He even suggests that the great master himself was the designer. The form of the head, the character of the hair and the shape of the eye are, according to Burckhardt, essentially modern. Those who prefer to regard the statue as an antique direct attention to a description of a picture by the Lemnian Philostratus (Philostrati Junioris, *Icones* II, *Marsyas*) where a group in which a similar figure existed is described. Though the conception may be antique, the technique is certainly suggestive of modern art. It may very well be a sixteenth century repetition of an antique that has been lost. Whatever conclusion

critics may come to, the statue will continue to be admired by all lovers of sculpture.—*Ed.*]

THE LATER JUNO HEAD OF THE VILLA LUDOVISI.

128. A marble bust in the Villa Ludovisi that differs from the colossal Juno head already described in that the diadem is not ornamented, a veil covers the back part of the head falling on the shoulders, and both features and expression are decidedly more modern.

Although in actual life both maidens and matrons were veiled, art made a distinction when representing mythological personages; at least during the best periods. Diana appears veiled in archaic statues, but the veil disappears in later art. Juno, Ceres, and Hestia, are the only three personages of whom veiling may be said to be characteristic. It characterizes the dignified, the earnest, and the solemn goddesses, and intensifies their special qualities.

The governing expression of this bust is gentleness. It marks the third step in the development of which the Farnese bust marks the first, and the colossal bust in this same collection the second. From this head all the severity of the archaic Juno has entirely disappeared. It must therefore be the latest of the three, though the time of its execution cannot be determined.¹

THE APOLLO BELVEDERE.

129. A marble statue found towards the close of the fifteenth century not far from Antium (Capo d'Anzo), a

¹ The point of the nose is modern. The head has been broken off and replaced and there are a few unimportant restorations about the fracture. I am inclined to regard this bust as a work of the Roman period. I can recall no Greek statue with such a long and thin nose. Nor does this peculiarity of the feature appear to be an accident. It is the result of a weak conception. The mouth is also weak. The statue may be interesting as marking a point in the development of the Juno type; but it shows the type developed away from all womanly strength and queenly attractiveness. The expression indicates long abuse. The veil is not so characteristic of personages as it is of periods. There are but few veiled statues that are not very early.

pleasure resort of the Roman emperors. Julius II bought it while cardinal, and when elected pope he had Michael Angelo remove it to the Vatican. The left hand and the fingers of the right hand were restored by Montorsoli, a pupil of Michael Angelo. Whether the marble of which the statue is made is Greek or Italian is still disputed. It is probably Italian.

The original motive of the statue has only been lately recognized. At first critics agreed with the restorer that the god held his bow in the left hand; and the only question was at what he had been shooting. A short time ago a statue was discovered in St. Petersburg which corresponds with this statue in every important particular and in which the original left hand is preserved. Instead of a bow it holds the ægis; so that the ægis must be presupposed for this statue. The god was represented terrifying an enemy by a show of the ægis on which was the awful head of Medusa. But who is the enemy? A first suggestion was that the Iliad had furnished the theme, and that the god is represented when, coming to the rescue of the Trojans, he puts the Greeks to flight by a show of the terrible ægis. Another notion is that the statue commemorates the repulse of the Gauls from the sacred shrine of Delphi in 278 B.C. According to the tradition the god, amid thunder and storm, appearing to the Gauls in heavenly beauty and holding the ægis, drove them headlong from Parnassus by the mere show of his divinely irritated presence. Certainly the myth could have no more admirable plastic illustration than is presented in this superb and superbly beautiful figure. Not as a warrior does the god oppose himself to his foes, but as an accidental and divine apparition he discomfits them and turns them to flight.

The Belvedere Apollo is not an original. A short time ago a head exactly corresponding to the head of the statue was found in Rome, but of a style so much more severe and dignified as to prove that the original must have been composed at a time when art was still in the

service of religion and when beauty of form was subordinate. Still it is difficult to regard the statue as copied from the bronze; for, as Goethe was the first to point out, one of the statue's chief attractions results from the material, the marble lending itself admirably to the brilliancy of its beauty.

If the statue owes its origin to the discomfiture of the Gauls at Delphi, then the time of its execution is fixed. Even before this supposition was advanced the very character of the work led critics to the conclusion that the work could not belong to the best periods of Greek sculpture. Winckelmann indeed praised it as the very highest possible product of Greek art. Apart from the discoveries made since his time, and which might have altered his judgment, his opinion is not in accord with the principles which he himself lays down for guidance in esteeming works of ancient art. According to his own principles the Apollo should not be esteemed as highly as he himself esteems it. Winckelmann was seduced by the poetry of the conception and by the beauty of the execution of this the most ideal, perhaps, of all Grecian statues. Nevertheless the statue does not come up to his standard, a standard which ever since his time has been universally accepted. Its impression is too sudden and of too great surprise. The simplicity and worth of former periods is far away. The artist did not think of the divinity of his god; but his fantasy used the god to represent a figure of gleaming and seducing beauty. He ornamented it with pomp and elegance. The sandals are adorned; the hair seems as if pomade had been used in fashioning its locks. How far are such subtleties from the dignity and severity of early art!¹

¹ When Delphi was stormed by the Gauls and the terror-stricken guardians of the temple besought their god's assistance, he is said to have replied that he himself and the white virgins would be present. It is historic that the repulse of the Gauls was partly owing to their having been terrified by a storm that prevailed at the time of the assault. It was not necessary for a people to be very imaginative to believe that Apollo and the white virgins were in the storm. As by

THE DIANA KNOWN AS THE DIANA OF VERSAILLES.(From Fröhner's catalogue of the Louvre.¹)

129a. Of all classical statues that represent Diana as a huntress the statue known as the Diana of Versailles is by far the most celebrated. Clothed in a short and very fine double chiton, of which the many folds leave bare the arms and the legs from the knees, the goddess in full course pursues the game. Her mantle, which passes over the left shoulder, is tied about the waist so as in no way to impede the rapidity of her movements. She wears a diadem; her hair is knotted at the back of her head; her sandals are profusely ornamented.

The artist has represented the moment when the divine huntress stops to draw an arrow from her quiver. In the

the white virgins were undoubtedly meant Minerva and Diana, it is supposed that the statue was grouped with two others representing these goddesses. Overbeck finds in the Diana of Versailles the type of one, and in a Minerva of the Capitol in Rome the type of the other. (G. e. G. Plastik II, p. 252.)

The majority of critics do not agree with Friederichs, but refer the statue back to a bronze original. The folds of the garment that hang from the left arm and shoulder are suggestive of bronze work.

The statue is without exception the most beautiful representation of the male form that antiquity has furnished. It may not have the severity and dignity of early times; but it presents as does no other work the power of superhuman beauty, and it has as much dignity as is consistent with such a representation. It would seem as if the mere show of such beauty would as easily put to flight those who were to be terrified as it would irresistibly attract those whom the god would draw unto him. I sympathize perfectly with all the extreme admiration the statue has excited. There are heads, besides the one referred to by Friederichs, which are evidently copies of the one original. In some of these heads treatment is simpler and more severe, showing, perhaps, that they are nearer the original; but no one of them approaches the Vatican head for pure and noble beauty. The Vatican statue is without doubt a copy, but the copyist was an artist of great genius who found in the original a proper subject for showing his power in the representation of beauty.

¹ I prefer Fröhner's description to Friederichs,' from which it differs in some particulars, because it was written in the presence of the original while Friederichs' description evidently had no better inspiration than a cast.

left hand, which is held down, was the bow. She turns her head as if attracted by a sound behind her. The golden-horned Ceryneian hind, the favorite animal of Diana, accompanies her mistress. The tree-trunk which supports the statue suffices to indicate a forest.

The qualities of this piece of sculpture, which cannot be earlier than the first century of our era, have given rise to endless discussion. The Diana of Versailles is a perfect pendant to the Apollo Belvedere. In the two works there is such conformity of motive, of style and of execution that, even if they are not the work of the same artist, they must be of the same school and of the same period. The ingenious theory that the two belonged to a votive group representing the Delphic deities hastening to the defence of their sacred shrine from the threatening Gauls has no valid argument to sustain it. At all events no comparison can be made between the two statues and statues that are undoubtedly Greek; for the sculpture is decidedly Roman. But though dry it is not lacking in most excellent qualities. The face of Diana shows admirably the chaste and severe character of the virgin goddess. Strong, vigorous, and virile, she pursues her prey. Her elastic muscles and nervous legs indicate a quick and sure step. The drapery tossed by the wind and the leaping hind by her side show her rapidity of movement.

There are numerous repetitions of the figure. They occur on Greek coins of all ages and of all countries. The restored parts are the nose, the two ears, a piece of the neck, the right forearm and hand, the left hand and arm to near the shoulder, the end of the left big toe, the right foot and the upper part of the right leg, and the two ends of the quiver. There are other bits of modern work in the hair, in the drapery, and elsewhere. The legs were evidently rubbed down and repolished by the restorer. The nose, the ears, the horns, and a large part of the legs of the hind, are also modern. The head is original but replaced. The statue was brought to France during the reign of Francis I. It derives its name from the fact that

Louis XIV had it removed to Versailles, where it remained till the time of the French revolution.¹

¹ Friederichs calls attention to the small size of the head and of the upper part of the body in comparison with the legs. He thinks the statue an undoubted copy of a Greek work of a good period, and though not accepting Overbeck's theory, he recognizes the identity of technique with that of the Vatican Apollo. For my part I do not think that any valuable opinion can be formed. The arts of the period under consideration are less understood than those of any other period of Greek or of Roman history. Friederichs in common with all other authors apparently throws into this period a vast number of works simply because he can assign them to no other. They are as wide apart in conception and in execution as possible. I am satisfied that the arts of the period have not as yet been properly studied. It may be that there are no materials in existence for this study; but until the period is better known, opinions should be advanced with reserve and not given with dogmatism. The impression so far made on my mind is that many of the works assigned by Friederichs and others to the period of the Diadochi are either of earlier or of later origin. The absence of historic allusions to artists and to works of art must not be overlooked. German critics are too much under the influence of their own theories. They start with the notion that at one time all art was under the influence of religious strictness and severity, and that at all times this influence must be considered. This may be true in sculpture that was devoted to religious uses; but art at all times from its birth-day must have been free to exert itself in all directions.

The times of the Diadochi were not artistic. They were practical and materialistic periods. Nor is there any intrinsic evidence to prevent assigning many of the works so far discussed to the time of Alexander the Great, and in referring those in which sensuality is conspicuous to that time under the Roman emperors when Greek skill was forced to administer to lust. No true evolution of art has as yet been established. One principle is evident; and that is, that whoever attempts to investigate art from any but its own point of view will fall into error. Art needs certain circumstances for existence; but when those circumstances exist, it has a life that is quite independent of history, politics, or religion. That art was confined to religion, even in the earliest period of Greek history, cannot be proved. Religion may have been able to control the best skill. Religious works were perhaps the most highly prized, and, consequently being the best cared for, have lasted. But such people as were the Greeks must have graced all their acts, and decorated all their resorts, with art. The more outspoken they were the more freely must all their doings have been reflected in art. It is time for independence from the teaching of German thought on this subject.

The third figure to which Overbeck alludes as having a place in the Delphi group is, as already stated, represented by a statue in the Capitol in Rome. The figure is clothed in a long double chiton which reaches to the feet. About the neck is the ægis. The head and the

THE SO-CALLED JASON.

130. [A statue of great excellence representing a young man fastening his sandal. He is nude with the exception of a piece of drapery that hangs over his right thigh. His right foot is on a rock. His hands approach the foot. The right hand has already taken hold of one of the straps of the sandal. The head of the figure is slightly turned, as if attention had been suddenly attracted. There are many copies in existence; showing that they are all derived from some one celebrated original. The best copy is in the Louvre. One very much restored is in the Glyptothek of Munich. Another is in the collection of the Marquis of Lansdowne; and a small and very poorly executed copy is in the Vatican. The Vatican copy differs from the others in that the figure stands on the right leg and places the left foot on the rock. The statue has been variously named. The first name applied was Cincinnatus. In accordance with this idea, a ploughshare was added to the Paris copy some time during the sixteenth century. Jason was the name selected by Winckelmann. Though evidently incorrect it will probably adhere. The term *Μονοκρήπις* is applied to Jason by Pindar (P. 4, 133), and Winckelmann supposed that the statue represents the haste with which Jason hurried to Pelias, forgetting to

arms are modern. The figure is moving quickly to the left, the action corresponding to the action of the Diana of Versailles where the action is of equal velocity and is directed to the right. In Overbeck's history of Greek plastic art he has introduced a sketch of the three statues grouped in accordance with his theory.

The Diana, with her long, large, and tough legs does by no means present a divine appearance. The great beauty of the statue is in the face; there, too, is the resemblance to the Apollo the most striking. There are no two faces of more grand, pure, and noble beauty in the whole realm of art. The faces are as much akin as those of the Venus of Milo and the Olympian Mercury. Their special attribute seems to be bright and intelligent vivacity. In comparison, all the faces of former periods seem dull if not heavy. And yet the intelligence and the vivacity displayed are purely classical. The faces do not show a trace of modern thought or sentiment.

put on his other sandal. As the other sandal, which is by the side of the figure, is antique in some of the copies and undoubtedly formed part of the original statue, and as there is absolutely nothing to suggest Jason, Winckelmann's idea can be dismissed as hasty. Another notion, supported by Friederichs and also by Heinrich Brunn, is that the figure represents Mercury in his character of the messenger of the gods. At one and the same time he hears the message and prepares himself to carry it. There are coins and vases on which Mercury is represented in a similar attitude. Fröhner, on the other hand, is of the opinion that at no period of Greek art could divinity under any circumstances have been represented in such ordinary attitude and action. He therefore regards the statue as the portrait statue of a successful gymnast, or the happy effort of an artist to show mastery of the anatomy of the human form. I am inclined to accept Fröhner's opinion. The statue is entirely destitute of any of the qualities of a work of art. It makes no appeal to the sentiments. The head has no expression whatsoever. The attitude is graceless; the motive is common. Still there is nothing to prevent this statue being assigned to the very best period of Greek art; nothing to prevent its being attributed to such a master as Lysippus. That the original was in bronze is evident. In the marble the support detracts so much from the effect that the conception must have been for metal. It may be that such statues as this one, the Borghese Gladiator, and the statue in the Louvre known as Germanicus, were executed by skilful artists and served as models in art schools. Such care in the anatomy was for some purpose, and there does not seem to be any other purpose than that of rudimentary education that could possibly have been served. — *Ed.*]

NEMESIS.

131. A marble statue found in Hadrian's Villa near Tivoli and now in the Vatican. The right arm is modern.

Originally the hand undoubtedly held some attribute. The statue represents a young female very simply dressed in the double chiton, of which one end reaches to her feet while the other end goes diagonally across the waist. The head gently bows to the left. The hair is short and curly and is bound about with a fillet. The arms are bare. Face and attitude are very youthful. The left hand is drawn up to the left shoulder making the forearm somewhat conspicuous. As the Greek ell corresponds to the length of the forearm the ordinary notion is that the gesture of the goddess is symbolical, indicative of the measure she metes out to human actions. There is no reason, however, why this ordinary gesture should have any other meaning here than the usual one; that is, to indicate modesty or bashfulness: especially as the attitude of the head is perfectly in accord with these sentiments. And how could Nemesis be more happily represented than in the form of a modest and bashful virgin whose whole being seems to express the moral qualities of the Greek αἰδώς?¹

VICTORY SLAYING A BULL.

132. Two marble groups found in 1773 by Gavin Hamilton in the Villa of Antoninus Pius at Lanuvium. They belonged to the Towneley collection and with it passed into the British Museum. In each group, the wings and the right arm of the victory are modern. Each group represents a winged victory who has caught a bull; has brought it to the ground; places one knee on

¹ The figure is very interesting for the information it conveys of the ideas held by the Greeks about this goddess. No conception could be farther away from the ideas generally held nowadays; that is, that she was an avenging fury.

The original from which the statue was copied must have been a most charming work of art. The drapery is particularly excellent: it is in itself a revelation of gentleness and modesty. Though Nemesis had many sanctuaries, and though classical authors mention many statues of the goddess, but few plastic representations of her have been preserved. Her figure often occurs on coins and on vases. A repetition is in the Lateran Museum.

its back; holds its head back by the nose, and is about to give the fatal blow. The artist does not present the actual killing, but makes a lively and poetic picture of the fleeing bull just caught by his pursuer. There are so many representations of similar scenes that they must have been made for merely ornamental purposes as well as to record a victory. The composition is undoubtedly Greek, but the nudity of the Victory and the pathetic character of the whole indicate a time not anterior to Alexander the Great.¹

THE MEDUSA RONDANINI.

133. [A mask in high relief of Medusa; formerly in the Rondanini palace in Rome; purchased in 1808 by Louis of Bavaria, and since his time in the Glyptothek of Munich. The tip end of the nose, a bit of the left nostril, the heads and tails of the snakes, and small parts of the hair, are modern.

In contrast to the exaggerated and grotesque representations of the early period, Medusa is here represented with the face and features of humanity. The features are not beautiful, but they are strictly human and if endowed with life would be pleasing. The object the artist had in view, and which strikes the beholder at once and

¹ There are differences between the two groups that are worth noting. In one the Victory kneels with the right knee; in the other with the left. Though the right arm of each is restored, in one the arm was farther advanced than in the other and the actual stabbing of the bull was taking place. In one, the only garment has fallen down the back while its two ends come round in front and float back from between the legs; in the other, the garment goes about the left arm and the right thigh; in each, the garments express most admirably an alighting after rapid flight. The bulls differ of course so as to correspond with the victories. Some critics refer the type as far back as Myron. Overbeck refers it to Menæchmus who flourished about 500 B.C. (See Plin., N.H., xxxiv, c. 19.) The latest criticism would not regard the nudity and the pathos referred to by Friederichs as obstacles to referring the type back to the time of Phidias, or in fact to any late date when such technique was possible. Art was far more extensively used and practised among the Greeks than critics of twenty years ago were inclined to acknowledge.

with irresistible power, was to represent a soulless face ; a being in which life was without sentiment, emotion, or thought ; a stony, frozen, yet living, horror. The bat's wings and the snakes that poke their heads out from between the tresses over the eyebrows and tie their tails under the chin add to the terror the face inspires, but the great power of the artist is seen in the eyes and mouth. Such soulless features are to be found nowhere else in art. It is like meeting one of the shades of Homer's Hades. No wonder that persons of keen sensibilities turn away from this work of most wonderful art and cannot be induced to look again.

Brunn is of the opinion that the mask was attached to a building, and that the surrounding architecture made the stoniness of the mask all the more apparent. As the mask is only about a foot in diameter it would have been unobserved on a building of any altitude. Brunn is also of the opinion that the technique of the work points to the Roman period. Perhaps the head of a dead Messalina served the artist as model. — *Ed.*]

THE FARNESE HERCULES.

134. [A colossal statue of Hercules found in 1540 during the pontificate of Paul III in the ruins of the baths of Caracalla. When found, the left hand, some of the fingers of the right hand with the apples, and according to Clarac the legs also, were wanting. Clarac states that the legs were not found till three years afterward in a cistern three miles from Rome. Before the legs were found their places were supplied by plaster legs modelled from a design by Michael Angelo. The statue was acquired by the Farnese family and was removed with their collection to Naples in 1790. It is now one of the chief attractions of the Naples Museum.

The statue is supposed to represent Hercules in repose. The body is slightly bent forward and to the left, and is partially supported by the club. The club, which is

covered by the lion's skin, is directly under the left shoulder and rests on a rock. The left arm hangs wearily down by the side of the club. The right hand rests on the hips back of the body with the palm out. In the hand the restorer has placed three apples, the apples of the Hesperides. As the last labor of the demi-god was to obtain these apples, he is supposed to be resting after the accomplishment of all his labors. The muscular development of the statue is enormous; yet the figure is not heavy, but active.

The statue has been, and continues to be, the subject of animated discussion. Near the club on the rock is an inscription setting forth the statue as the work of Glycon, an Athenian: and as the "ω" in Glycon is of a form not used till about the beginning of the Christian era, this particular statue cannot be of earlier date. The marking of the iris of the eye is another indication of work of about the first century. The Hercules type represented by this statue recurs, however, so frequently in statues, on coins, and in reliefs, that some one great original must have created it, an original as some critics claim that may have been as early as the time of Lysippus. A very indifferent repetition found on the Palatine hill in Rome, and now standing in the court of the Pitti palace in Florence bears, indeed, the name of Lysippus; but both Maffei and Beck question the antiquity of the inscription. Lysippus is stated by classic writers to have made a colossal Hercules resting after his labors; but it is distinctly added that the statue was a seated statue. The very great muscular development and the complete absence of all ideality would seem to point to a later date than that of Lysippus.

Another notion, and one that has many supporters, is that the statue formed part of a group, and that the group consisted of Hercules, his infant son Telephus nourished by the hind, and the eagle of Jove perched on one side on a rock; the idea being that Hercules in his travels, coming suddenly upon his infant and deserted

son, and stopping to contemplate him, is led to sad reflections upon the miseries of his own existence. The attitude and the expression are quite as indicative of attention as of reflection. The head does not seem to be so much bent in thought as bent to observe some object on the ground. There is also a certain fixedness and intensity in the look that are not in keeping with the idea of reverie and meditation. This intensity of look is far more strongly expressed in the head of the British Museum. The idea, expressed above, that the sight of his child makes his own miseries more keen, accords admirably with the English head. This head, too, is in technique so superior to the head of the Naples statue that it must be far nearer the original. Hercules so grouped occurs on coins and gems, and has been found in relief among the ruins of Pergamus. A picture discovered at Herculaneum presents a similar group with additional figures.

The conclusion to which criticism is pointing is that the original work was a group, was post-Alexandrian, and was probably of the school of Pergamus; but that the Naples figure was never grouped.

The anatomy of the figure is of the highest excellence though exaggerated to be in keeping with the character of the hero. The conception is grand, but too materialistic to allow the statue to be ranked with works of art of the best periods. — *Ed.*]

THE HERCULES TORSO OF THE BELVEDERE.

135. Found in Rome not far from the ruins of Pompey's theatre during the pontificate of Julius II, and since his time in the Belvedere of the Vatican.¹

From the irons in the back part of the statue it is evident that at a very early period attempts were made at restoring. How the statue should be restored has been a

¹ Arms, head, neck, a part of the breast, and the legs from the knees down, are wanting. The fragment is seated and bends slightly forward and to the right.

subject of much discussion. It was for a long time supposed that Hebe stood on the left; but the efforts of sculptors to effect such a restoration have shown it to be impossible.¹ Critics have now gone back to the opinion of Winckelmann and Heyne that Hercules is represented as seated alone; and that the statue should be restored so as to resemble the famous seated statue of Hercules by Lysippus which held a cup in the right hand and the club in the left. According to this notion the projection on the left knee marks where the club rested. However restored the statue undoubtedly represents Hercules at the moment when he is clothed upon with divinity. This was Winckelmann's idea, whose inspired description of the statue still remains the most excellent judgment ever passed upon it. In comparison with this veinless, elastic, and transfigured form, he regards the Farnese Hercules as a mere mass of muscular clay. Dannecker, the great Danish sculptor, in comparing it with the Laocoon, says that the Torso is flesh; the Laocoon, marble. If, however, the Torso be compared with the statues of the Parthenon, which are now recognized as showing forth the nude in its greatest beauty, it will be perceived that in the Torso there is a certain exaggeration of refinement in the treatment. In the Parthenon marbles the nude is fresher and more elastic; in the Torso, the flesh seems so soft as to be too sensitive. Winckelmann asserted that Greek artists in order to make the statues of their gods appear more ethereal did not indicate the veins. The Parthenon marbles, which were unknown to Winckelmann, show that veinlessness was a refinement of a later period when expression was sought to be made by altering natural forms.

The artist of the Torso, Apollonius the son of Nestor, who has carved his name on the rock on which the figure sits, cannot have lived earlier than the time of Pompey.

¹ Clarac states that Gibson, the celebrated English sculptor, made a model showing that such a restoration was not only possible but most probably the correct one.

As the statue was found near Pompey's theatre, it may have been one of the statues that adorned it.¹

THE SAMOTHRACE VICTORY OF THE LOUVRE.

136. [One of the most noticeable, and one of the most interesting of the marbles of the Louvre is a large fragment of a Victory discovered in 1863 on the island of Samothrace by M. Champoisseau, the French consul to the island. The fragment is of a colossal winged Victory sweeping down through the air and in the very act of alighting. The head, arms, feet, and all the right side of the breast, are wanting. The remaining parts are put together from one hundred and eighteen pieces. The statue must originally have been at least twelve feet high. The action is remarkable for its vigor and sweep. Still more remarkable is the drapery, which for truth, delicacy, and beauty of execution is unrivalled in ancient or modern art. I know of no other statue in which there is so much of free, and perfectly natural, irregularity in the drapery. The artist was so sure of his own ability that he discarded all arrangements accepted and fixed by art, and moved forward guided only by his own powers of invention. In quality the drapery equals the best drapery of the Parthenon statues while excelling it in delicacy and in fineness of texture. In its arrangement the artist has displayed an absolute and most remarkable originality.

In 1875 an Austrian expedition to Samothrace resulted

¹ Winckelmann's description is in his "History of Ancient Art," B. 10, c. 3, p. 16. It is full of the enthusiasm of which Winckelmann always had a supply, and is not free from the errors which are to be found in all his writings. He presumes that the right arm was back of the head; an impossible position. He refers to the breast of Hercules as the place where the monster Geryon was crushed; mistaking Antæos for Geryon, etc. Criticism that is replete with error is not to be recommended to the student. However delightful Winckelmann may be to one who has knowledge to correct error, and taste assured against the beguilements of eloquence; as a guide to the young he is as dangerous as Ruskin.

in the finding of the pediment on which the statue stood. This pediment represents the prow of a ship, and is of help in determining more precisely the character of the statue and in ascertaining the date of its execution.

The ship's prow makes it clear that the statue was executed to commemorate a naval victory. There is in the Berlin Museum a coin of the time of Demetrius Poliorcetes on which is represented the prow of a ship bearing a figure which recalls the fragment. The figure is blowing a long trumpet which it holds in the right hand, while in the other hand is held a long rod which the Victory may intend to set up as a trophy.

In 306 B.C. Demetrius and his father Antigonus gained at sea near Cyprus a notable victory over Ptolemæus, the result of which was that Demetrius and his father secured to themselves the title and the position of independent sovereigns. This magnificent commemorative statue may well have been erected at the time; and representations of it may subsequently have been engraved on coins in accordance with a very well-known Greek custom. The fragment, which from the first was thoroughly appreciated by French artists and critics, is beginning to find recognition in Germany. See the last edition of Overbeck's *History of Greek Sculpture*, vol. ii, p. 316. — *Ed.*]

PARIS AND HELEN.

137. A marble relief formerly in the collection of the Duke of Noja, now in the Naples Museum. It represents Venus and Cupid persuading the still hesitating Helen and Paris to obey the instincts of love. Venus and Helen are seated together on a bench to the left; Helen is the nearer to the spectator. Venus turns towards Helen and puts her right arm about her neck. Her left hand rests on the left knee and very gently points towards Paris, who with Cupid is standing on the right of the relief. Helen still holds her head down; and with her right

hand makes a slight gesture of dissent. Paris at the extreme left of the composition, points with his left hand to heaven. He looks down on Cupid, who, drawing near to him in confidence, and looking up into his face, rests the left arm on his right shoulder. The gesture of Paris seems to call the attention of the god of love to the gods above who protect the sanctity of marriage, and who punish the violation of its vows. The scene is supposed to take place in the abode of Helen. The high boots worn by Paris indicate that he has just returned from a journey. On a column back of Helen is a little seated figure of Peitho, the goddess of persuasion. Her small size, the position, and the meditative attitude, indicate that the goddess is not exercising her full power; but, as a local divinity, is pervading the place with her influence. Her presence, however, gives assurance that the efforts of Venus and Cupid will be successful; a result left in doubt by the action of both Helen and Paris; for though they do not decline they still hesitate. In her left hand Peitho holds a bird; this must be the bird Inyx, her child by Pan who was changed into a bird by Juno for having attempted by charms to attract Jupiter to Io. On her head is the modius to show the fruitful results that follow a yielding to her persuasions.

There are many repetitions of this work in existence, all derived from an original of a good Greek period; for the composition is delicate, the figures are graceful, and the relief is of the slightly raised character of the best periods of art. Still it cannot be placed earlier than the middle of the fourth century; for before that time such love scenes were unknown to art.¹ The style of the work shows the art tendencies of the school of Praxiteles. The soft forms of the Cupid are especially suggestive of Praxiteles. With the exception of the Cupid, whose figure is most easily recognized, all the figures are named. The inscribing of names on reliefs dates back to the earliest

¹ There is no evidence to sustain this assertion.

art-periods and lasted to the time of the highest art developments. It is rarely found in later work. In later classic art, as in the beginnings of modern painting and sculpture, entire verses are sometimes added in the way of explanation; but here the object is not to assist in recognizing figures, but to give greater life to the whole composition and to make the subject itself more prominent.¹

THE STATUE KNOWN AS THE BORGHESE GLADIATOR.

138. A statue found at the beginning of the seventeenth century at Capo d'Anzo, the old Antium; first in the possession of the Borghese family; since 1808 in the Louvre. The right arm and the right ear are modern.

The statue represents a nude warrior who, striding rapidly forward with the right leg first, looks upward and to the left, and holds the left arm up for defence while drawing the right arm well back to give greater force to a final blow.

The circular object on the left arm is the central support of a shield, and the fingers of the left hand are bent as if they were passing through the other, that is the outer, support. It is not to be supposed that a shield

¹ This is one of the most charming works of antiquity. Nor is there anything in the subject, or in the manner in which the subject is treated, to prevent assigning the original conception to the best art periods. The playful and sportive spirit in which the Greeks at times, at least some of them, regarded their mythology is abundantly evidenced in the Homeric hymns.

The relief is of fine artistic excellence and conveys a clear idea of the inherent principles which make Greek sculpture so absolutely supreme in the domain of art. To appreciate the work one must know that the Greeks enjoyed their myths, and must enjoy them too. Paris lifts his left arm to heaven only to make a show of resistance, while the little Cupid with his right arm a-kimbo might almost be taken from Punch, so evident is it that he appreciates the whole situation. The little Peitho perched on the top of her column is not without a touch of the comic in her pose and expression, as if humorously comparing her size with her power. Greek digammatists may be offended at such criticism; but until we learn to look at the Greeks with a true Greek eye we shall miss the best of their teaching.

ever existed; for the surface of the small object on the arm is quite smooth and polished, and if a shield had ever been there it would have left traces. The artist was satisfied with indicating the shield, and an indication sufficed for all his purposes.

The figure is that of a warrior, or gladiator, defending himself with the shield on the left arm from an adversary who is placed on a higher level, on horseback for instance, and whom he holds keenly in his eye. The action, however, is not entirely of defence. The attitude of defence, in which the left foot would have been in advance of the right, has been abandoned. The attack has already commenced, and a blow is about to be given with the sword which must be imagined in the right hand. The adversary's blow has already been parried and the counter blow has started. This action explains the intense expression of the face.

It is difficult to understand how this figure could have suggested any one of the heroes of antiquity. It is still more strange that it should have been named Achilles, or Theseus. The profile, the whole head in fact, is utterly unideal, and offers a specimen of most ordinary nature. But this ordinary type served the sculptor's object. The statue undoubtedly stood alone, and the foe who is fixed by the glance is only to be imagined; for, according to the rules of composition, it would be impossible to group with this figure another figure placed upon a higher level. Again: the inscription which is on the support would have been placed nearer the centre of the group if a group existed. It was evidently not the intention of the artist to represent any particular combat, but an incident of combat, and for such a purpose a figure that could be recognized and named would have been inappropriate. The artist does not tell against whom the warrior is fighting or what he is fighting about. All such interests are intentionally disregarded in order to concentrate attention upon the artistic qualities of the statue. He has also selected a position in which all the details of anatomy are

most fully exposed, and exposed with such exactness that the statue is celebrated as an anatomical model.¹ The artist's intention, therefore, being to attract attention to anatomical skill, it is easy to understand why there should be no allusion to place or person, and why even the helmet should be away. An actual shield would have impeded one view of his work.

The statue must be of a comparatively late date; for in earlier and better periods art occupied itself with events or with character, and not with mere representing. The slight figure, which seems more active than strong, and the very small head, are other evidences of later art. The inscription proclaims that Agasias the son of Dositheos from Ephesus is the artist. Though nothing is known of this artist or of his father, the character of the letters shows that the inscription cannot be earlier than the time of Sulla, though it may be much later. The statue is more suggestive of the end of Greek art than of the beginning of Roman art.²

THE FLORENTINE WRESTLERS.

139. A marble group found at the same time and in the same place with the Niobe group and for many years supposed to belong to it; at first in the Medici Villa in Rome; since 1677 in Florence and now in the Tribune of the Uffizi.

The group represents two wrestlers in a very complicated attitude. One is supported on his knees and his left hand. His knees are somewhat apart. His breast

¹ I believe that Gerdy, the famous French plastic anatomist, found but one error in the statue, and that in one of the smaller tendons of the heel of the left foot.

² On the supposition that anatomy was not studied among the Greeks as it is to day; that is, in the dissecting room, the statue may have been executed for the purpose of giving instruction in anatomy. It may have occupied a central and conspicuous position in some school of art. It is still one of the most excellent of models for the young draughtsman.

is pressed down upon his right knee. His left arm is held up behind him by the other wrestler who is on top of him and pressing him down to the ground. The upper wrestler has his left leg twisted about the other's left leg while he presses down with his left side and shoulder; at the same time he raises his right arm as if to strike. The upper wrestler looks down upon his adversary; the other one looks to the left with an expression of pain and despair. Portions of the legs, the right arm of the victorious wrestler, and the left hand of the other one, are modern. The group is put together from many fragments and many small bits have been supplied. The heads are antique but not the original ones. They evidently belonged to a Niobe group, and were selected at the time when the wrestlers were supposed to be Niobes.

The right hand of the victor is hardly properly restored, as in wrestling no blows were given, and that the two are wrestling is most evident. The match is undoubtedly of that kind which were continued till one of the contestants declared himself conquered. The efforts which the under combatant is making to raise himself from the ground are plainly seen, also the superior strength by which he is restrained. That this group, of which the figures are entirely occupied with themselves, is a complete and independent composition, and is in no way connected with the Niobe group, is now universally admitted. The group in its entire character differs from the Niobes. The artist strove after no high moral or intellectual impression; his only object was to present the highest elasticity of which the muscles of the body are capable.

Pliny (N. H., xxxvi, 24), in speaking of Cephisodotus, a son of Praxiteles, states that there is by him at Pergamus a splendid "Symplegma." This may mean an intertwining of lovers, but probably means an intertwining of wrestlers. Pliny adds that the flesh is so elastic that "*digitis corpori verius quam marmori impressis*," fingers being impressed upon flesh rather than upon marble. If

this means that the fingers of the group are, and not that the fingers of the spectator might be, impressed; then the Pliny group and the Florentine group have not the same origin, for in the Florentine group the hands of the combatants are not impressed upon the flesh. Still the two groups had the same tendency, that is, a refined exposition of flesh.¹

THE DIANA OF GABII.

140. A marble statue found in 1792 in the neighborhood of Gabii, about ten miles from Rome. At first it belonged to the Borghese collection; since 1808 it has been in the Louvre. The right hand and the lower part of the left leg are restorations. On account of the manner in which the under-garment is girdled, and on account of a slight resemblance of the head to the head of the Diana of Versailles, the statue is regarded as a Diana preparing herself for the chase. But in the absence of bow and quiver this explanation can hardly be accepted. Another notion is that the figure is one of Diana's nymphs. This second supposition has nothing to support it. The statue is probably a genre piece: the artist's only intention having been to represent a graceful maiden in the act of dressing.

Very few works of antiquity surpass this work in grace,

¹ The group was found at the same time as the Niobe group and in the same place, but not so near to it as to justify the supposition that the two belonged to the same composition. There are more restorations than Friederichs mentions. The entire left arm of the under fighter is modern, and much larger portions of all the legs. The restorer has placed a support under the left leg of the conquering wrestler. If this support were away it would be better understood how he holds the left leg of his opponent with his own. The action would then appear a good illustration of the Greek verb *ὑποσκελίζω*. It may be that the upper wrestler intends to seize the right hand of his adversary with his own right and then taking his adversary's left with his own left he will apparently have him completely in his power. Like the Borghese gladiator the group is only a display of anatomical skill, but it has an advantage over the gladiator in that it displays interesting action.

yet the action is of so ordinary a character that the statue can not be placed earlier than the time of Lysippus.¹

THE SO-CALLED CERES OF THE VATICAN.

141. A marble statue formerly in the possession of the Mattei family; purchased by Clement XIV for the Vatican. The left hand and the ears of corn it holds are modern. The head has been broken off and reset. There is some doubt whether it be the original head. The name Ceres which has been given to this statue is hardly correct. The head, if it be the original head, is far too young for the head of a goddess, and the ears of corn are a fancy of the restorer. The careful arrangement of the hair would seem to indicate a portrait. Such careful arrangement of hair, however, is sometimes seen on ideal statues. The forms of the head and face are Greek, so also is the arrangement of the drapery. The drapery is singular in that the under-garment shows through the outer one.²

¹ Friederichs does scant justice to this lovely statue, one of the gems of the Louvre collection. Both Clarac and Visconti recognize it as Diana, and each of these authors refers to several repetitions which either are, or were, in existence. The very natural action is not inconsistent with the Greek idea of divinity. The drapery is managed with most artistic skill. The left hand holds up the mantle in such a way that its edge about divides the person. On one side are seen the straight lines of the under-garment, and the contrast between these and the curved and falling lines of the outer garment is one of the most charming effects of ancient art. An argument against the nymph theory is that nymphs are generally represented with one breast bare. The modesty of the drapery is an argument for Diana.

² The statue is especially remarkable for the richness of the drapery and for the great skill displayed in its arrangement. In this particular few statues of antiquity compare with it. The right hand which rests on the right hip is entirely hidden by the mantle. An arrangement already observed in statues of Polyhymnia, suggesting therefore that this statue may be a nymph. The restoration of the left hand cannot be correct; for it seems to pass through the mantle. There is in the Glyptothek of Munich a bust of the same head. The Munich bust is most highly lauded by Brunn and by other German critics. Unfortunately it has been so restored, damaged and discolored, that its original beauty is obscured, and a cast is better for judging than the

THE WATER-MAIDEN.

142. A marble statue found not far from Rome; purchased by W. v. Humboldt, and now in the palace of the Humboldt family at Tegel near Berlin. The head, the elevated left arm with the water-jug, the right arm with a bit of the drapery, and the right foot, are modern. The restorations are supposed to be by Thorwaldsen.

Of the many repetitions of this statue no one is entire; yet there can be little doubt as to the correctness of the restoration. The work represents a maiden at a spring, stooping for water and gracefully holding up her garments to prevent them from getting wet. W. v. Humboldt, who had the figure daily before his eyes, has honored it with a sonnet in which he especially praises the unconscious natural grace displayed. The statue is certainly one of the most graceful works of ancient art. Of all the repetitions in existence no one approaches this one in artistic worth. It moreover differs in its small size, though the size can hardly be that of the original. The small size seems indeed to be in keeping with the character of the composition; but where various copies exist of various sizes the larger copies are apt to be nearer the original; for an original is much more apt to be reduced than increased in the copy.

As to its date, it may be asserted that the statue does not belong to the classic period of art; that is, to a period anterior to Alexander. The garment has a peculiarity that is not found in early work; that is, the under-gar-

original. I must confess my inability to perceive the great beauty of the bust. The face is very stern and very haughty; so much so that I am inclined to accept the portrait theory. The eyes are comparatively small and have a sinister expression. The modelling is most excellent and worthy of all the praise that has been lavished upon it. If the work is to be referred to the best periods of art, as its admirers claim, then portraiture is much earlier than is generally supposed; for though the face is to a certain extent idealized, personal traits and character are so strong that the ideality must have been founded on individuality.

ment is recognized through the outer one. This peculiarity has already been observed in the so-called statue of Ceres, and is especially observable in the many statues of Polyhymnia; where, indeed, the drapery is far finer and more flowing than here.

The treatment of the drapery is not free from a certain studied refinement which shows the date of the statue still more clearly than the diaphanous character of the garments; for diaphanous garments were early used and may have been quickly adopted by art.

Though the statue may not belong to the very best period of Greek art, its most lovely grace shows it to be Greek and of an excellent school.¹

THE LOUVRE NYMPH WITH A SHELL.

143. [The statue represents a young girl reclining by the side of a stream and dipping water with a shell. She is leaning on her left hip, and supports herself in a semi-recumbent attitude with the left arm. The right hand

¹ W. von Humboldt's sonnet is as follows, S. W. III, p. 400, N. 17;

Nach Wasser geht sie zu des Pindus Quelle,
Hoch auf der Schulter das Gefäss sie trägt,
Und um den Fuss das Kleid behutsam leget,
Dass nicht benetzt es werde von der Welle.

Bestrahlt von wolkenlosen Tages Helle,
Der Bergbewohner Staunen sie erregt,
Wie selbst sich unbewusst sie Sorgfalt heget,
Dass dem Geschäft sie Schönheitsreiz geselle.

Wie in des Mädchens einfachem Gemüthe,
Der gleiche Trieb in der Natur auch lebet,
Was wild in ihren Kräften gärt und webet,
Umkleidet sie mit milder Schönheit Blüthe.
Vulkane brennen, Berge stürzen nieder,
Und Anmuth lacht aus dem Ruine wieder.

A sonnet about as meaningless and as vague as the ordinary sonnet produced by the ordinary sonnet-writer.

The reader will recall the Niobe statue in Florence called Anchirœe a counterpart of this statue. In the Blundell collection of Ince Hall there is said to be another repetition, and as difficult to get at as most English statues owned by Englishmen. Another repetition is in the Louvre.

passes to the right of the left hand and holds a shell. The drapery is so arranged that the right leg from the knee down is bare, also the left shoulder and breast. Position and attitude are most graceful. The right forearm, the left hand, and the shell it holds, are modern. On the base of the statue are marks which may be supposed to represent the rippling of the stream. The statue was originally in the Borghese collection. Many statues in existence bear a resemblance to it. In most of them, however, the figure is engaged in playing a game similar to the modern game of jack-stones, or in throwing dice (*ἀσπράγαλοι*). The dice-player of the Berlin Museum is, perhaps, the best of the type. These statues all point to a celebrated original to be referred to a period, whatever that may have been, when art cared more for graceful impression than for serious rendering. Modern criticism is not yet prepared to admit that the two tendencies could have existed at the same time.

In the copy in the British Museum the original plinth has been preserved. On it is a protuberance that resembles a bow terminating in the head of a bird. From this the inference is drawn by English critics that the original type represented one of the nymphs of Diana resting herself after the chase.

The statues are all very graceful, but too decorative in character to be referred to any great original. Some Greek artist of graceful conception may have composed the whole of them for the ornamentation of the fountain of some Roman millionaire.

There is a singular fragment in the British Museum which may be mentioned in connection with these figures, and with the game of jack-stones, or osselets. The fragment represents a boy seated on the ground, his right leg stretched out, his left bent under him; while with his two hands he grasps the arm of another boy and draws it to his mouth to bite it. The hand and part of the arm of the other boy are all that is left of him. The hand holds an osselet. The figure that has

been preserved is clothed with a coarse garment which leaves the legs and the arms bare. Pliny, while mentioning works in bronze by Polycleitus, states that he executed a group of two naked boys playing at dice. He adds that it is in the atrium of the Emperor Titus, and that in the estimation of many no work of art is superior to it. As the fragment was found in the ruins of the baths of Titus it may in some way be connected with the bronze of Polycleitus, a copy perhaps. If this idea be accepted it will be another link in the chain of evidence going to show that early art was more general and more liberal than has been heretofore supposed.— *Ed.*]

THE SO-CALLED GERMANICUS OF THE LOUVRE.

144. A marble statue purchased by Louis XIV from Pope Sixtus V ; at first at Versailles, now in the Louvre. The thumb and forefinger of the left hand are the only restorations. The name Germanicus was given to the statue on account of a supposed resemblance to his features. Busts of Germanicus subsequently discovered show that no such resemblance exists. The statue is nevertheless a portrait statue, and the features show it to be the portrait of a Roman.

The figure, with the exception of the head, is the copy of a well-known and beautiful Mercury type. This appears from gems and from a statue in the Villa Ludovisi where the same form is reproduced and where the head is easily recognized as the head of Mercury. The artist's intent was to represent a Roman as Mercury. This is further evidenced by the tortoise shell which was used by Mercury in the construction of the lyre and is one of his peculiar attributes. The figure also undoubtedly held the caduceus in the left hand ; and in such a way that the mantle, which now appears to be falling off the left shoulder, was kept in place by its pressure. The person honored by this statue was undoubtedly cele-

brated for his eloquence, for the Mercury type here used shows the god as the god of speech. The attitude shows intense concentration of thought. The figure is silent, and is solidly posed upon the whole length of each foot. The head is slightly bowed and the glance is fixed on the ground. So Homer describes Ulysses when persuasively speaking. He fixed his eyes on the ground that his concentration might be complete, and that the world about him might be shut out from his thoughts. The extent of the absorption in thought is shown in the drapery which falls from the shoulder without attracting the wearer's attention, and is only prevented from falling by the caduceus. The gesture of the right hand, however, indicates that the speaker is on the point of announcing his conclusions. The type used by the artist belongs to the noblest period of art. This is evident from the head of the statue in the Villa Ludovisi which shows the characteristics of the early and severe style of the time of Phidias. The whole figure is impressive and dignified. If compared with the so-called Jason, where Mercury is represented as the swift and agile messenger of the gods, the dignity of the figure will be the more apparent.

In the Ludovisi statue the right arm, which is modern, is not correctly restored. It is stretched out in the attitude of address, and is not at all in keeping with the rest of the figure. In fact the gesture gives a pathetic and an appealing appearance to the figure which is quite out of place. The forms of the Louvre statue are larger and more mature than those of the Ludovisi, as is becoming in a statue that represents an actual personage. As the artist had no intention of representing an ideal personage he naturally put the figure in accord with the head.

Ideality apart, the figure is one of the most excellent bequeathed by antiquity. As a model of anatomical excellence it is worthy to be placed by the side of the Borghese Gladiator.

An inscription on the tortoise states that the statue is by Kleomenes the son of Kleomenes, the Athenian. To

judge from the character of the letters, the artist lived about the beginning of the present era.¹

THE DYING ALEXANDER.

145. A marble head in the museum at Florence. The head is thrown back and to the right and bears an expression of agony. The name Alexander is justified by the great resemblance of the features to those of the many busts of Alexander in existence. That an artist should have undertaken to represent the youthful hero in the agonies of death is not a great improbability.

This head is one of the most precious bits of ancient sculpture extant. It shows the deepest and the purest pathos. And the execution is so finished, so soft and so flowing, that there can be no doubt that the work is an original. The head undoubtedly belongs to the time of the Diadochi; for in character it strikingly resembles the heads on the coins of that period; and then too it was for the first time that art gave full expression to a pathos emancipated from every rigidity, a pathos which in this head has its most perfect representation.²

¹ It may be that the artist of the Germanicus was the son of the artist of the Venus de Medici whose name is given as Kleomenes the son of Apollodorus, the Athenian; so that Apollodorus may have been the ancestor of two generations of distinguished artists. The statue is entirely nude with the exception of the drapery which is falling off of the left arm. The right hand is held up to nearly the level of the right ear. The thumb and fore-finger are joined by a slight support.

Clarac ventured the notion that the statue represents M. Marius Gratidianus, a friend of Cicero, a popular speaker and leader, who was twice prætor and who endeared himself especially to the people by proposing an edict regulating coinage (*edictum de re nummaria*). Clarac's notion is that the statue holds a coin between the thumb and forefinger of the right hand.

² It seems hardly possible that any artist should have presumed to represent the dying agonies of Alexander, especially at a time when the memory of the dead hero was still a potent political factor. The head more likely belonged to a statue representing an episode in the history of some mythological hero; for instance, Achilles struck to death by the arrow.

ANTIOCHIA.

146. [A marble group in the Vatican consisting of a female seated in a singular position on a rock ; and, at her feet, the half of a male figure apparently emerging from the ground. The female figure wears a crenelated crown to indicate that she is divine. In her right hand, which is bent up towards her chin, is a sheaf of wheat. The left hand is stretched out to the left and rests on the rock. The knees are turned to the right. This peculiar and somewhat expanded position gave the artist an opportunity to display great skill in the management of drapery.

This group is supposed to be copied from the far-famed group executed by Eutychides, a pupil of Lysippus, for the city of Antioch, and perhaps at the time when its foundations were laid by Seleucus Nicator ; that is, in the spring of the year 300 B.C. The not very conclusive grounds for this supposition are as follows ; the figure appears upon so many various Syrian coins that some one great original may be back of all these representations ; the statue was found where probably once stood the palace of C. Ummidius Durmius Quadratus, who was prefect of Syria under Claudius and Nero, whose name frequently appears on Syrian coins of the period, and who may have brought the statue back to Rome with him when he gave up his office ; and, lastly, Pausanias states that Eutychides executed for the Syrians who lived on the river Orestes a statue of Good Fortune which they held in high esteem.

The inhabitants of Antioch were often called the Syrians of the Orestes. According to the above supposition, the little half figure at the feet of the female is the river god of the Orestes, and is a half figure because the stream for a portion of its course is said to run under ground, emerging at the site of the city. These circumstances combine to give the group an interest which its artistic qualities do not excite. If any judgment whatsoever can be

formed of the original; that is, accepting the Vatican group as a copy of the original by Eutychides, one conclusion will be that at the time of the Diadochi, conceptions of divinity were neither solemn nor dignified. The attitude of the figure is attractive, but the crossing of the legs and the outstretching of the left hand are as far as possible from the noble and the divine. The beardless and youthful river god is more a subject for mirth than for reverence. — *Ed.*]

DECORATION OF A HERMES.

[From Heinrich Brunn's Catalogue of the Glyptothek, Munich.]

147. A relief in Attic, not Carrara, marble. H. 1.04 : Br. 1.40. Found in Naples. The face and the parts of the Hermes; the face, the right arm, the fingers of the left hand, and some bits of the drapery of the upright woman; the nose, a part of the head-dress, the ear, the points of the breasts, and some portions of the garments of the other woman, are modern.

In the centre of the relief and turned to the right is the Hermes of a bearded god. It stands on a high square pillar which rests on a low plinth. A young woman approaches from behind and is about to place a fillet about the head of the divinity. The fillet is of the kind that appears in representations of Bacchic ceremonies. The woman is clothed in a double chiton opened at the side. Where her beautiful forms are not disclosed they appear to shine through the drapery. In front of the Hermes is a more matronly female, clothed with chiton and mantle, and wearing on the head a species of skull cap and a round ornament that passes over the head from one ear to the other. An ornament of somewhat the same shape is sometimes seen on statues of the Roman period. The chiton is unbound and seems falling from the right shoulder. The woman is reaching with the right hand towards an object which has fallen to

the ground, which she has apparently seized with the toes of the right foot, and which the foot is lifting towards the hand. The body is consequently entirely supported on the left foot, and the left leg is slightly bent to assist in the action. The left hand grasps and pulls up the garments so as to keep them out of the way. The eyes all the while remain fixed on the Hermes. Having dropped her fillet, she must pick it up. As it was a law of some kinds of worship that the eyes must not be removed from the object during the ceremony, there results the peculiar action seen in the relief.

This relief is the more interesting because the action is derived from a much earlier relief taken from the balustrade of the Niké temple on the Acropolis at Athens. On the Niké relief a Victory is represented removing her sandal, or putting it on, while engaged in worship. In the Munich relief the figure is without wings, but the position is identical and even many of the folds in the drapery are the same. That the other figure is also derived from the Niké temple is very probable. There is a fragment to which it very nearly corresponds.

The execution though inferior to that of the Niké reliefs is still of a good Greek period. Though high, that Greek law is obeyed by which all projecting parts were kept within a certain imagined plain parallel to the background. The restorer unfortunately has not adhered to this rule, as is seen in the right arm of the standing female. Parts also of this figure have suffered from polishing.¹

¹ This relief and the Niké reliefs are proofs that during all the time that separates them the Greeks maintained the sportiveness and childishness of their religion.

An inspection and study of the works assigned by Friederichs and by other critics to this period produce the impression that as yet the sculpture of the period is not properly understood. The works are so diverse in character that they cannot be grouped and classified; nor are they especially characteristic or illustrative. The qualities they possess are negative rather than positive, and the inferences to be derived from them are also negative. If they teach anything it is that the period in which they were executed was not an artistic period in

GREEK-ROMAN ART.

It has already been stated that Greek-Roman art is hardly to be distinguished from the art of the time of Alexander and the Diadochi. It is still in dispute, for instance, whether the Laocoon belongs to the first or to the second of these periods. Similar questions have arisen about other works, the group called the Nile for instance; and there seems no possibility of ever obtaining decisive answers. Some critics deny to the Roman period all original artistic productiveness, especially in the domain of the ideal, and assert that the only artistic life of the times was of Greek origin. Others claim that the Roman period of the early Empire was in artistic advance of the Greek period immediately preceding it and even go so far as to speak of a restoration of art under the Roman emperors. The first of these opinions is undoubtedly correct so far as it relates to religious art; for those conditions of thought which are essential to success in religious art were not present during the reigns of the Roman emperors. At the same time criticism must not be carried so far as to assert that all the artistic productions of the Romans in the domain of the ideal were

the best and highest sense. The arts were cultivated, but very much as they are to-day in France. French painting of to-day shows the same diversity and the same lack of nobility and virile strength. Religious faith had disappeared, and art had ceased to be a power in the state. Still these ideas are mere suppositions as the arts of the period are virtually unknown. There is no one important work of which the date can be definitely stated; no one work that indicates a new, a distinct, and an independent school. The "Dying Gladiator," the Farnese Hercules and the Medici Venus may, for all that is positively known, and for all that the statues themselves show, be of the same time and of the same school, or of schools that were hundreds of years and hundreds of miles apart. Speculations are idle, and opinions must be deferred till antiquity is more bountiful.

unimportant and derivative. When such statues as the so-called *Thusnelda* of Florence, the *Augustus* of Berlin, and the *Agrippina* of Naples, were produced, there must have been activity and ability in all departments of profane art. The historic was undoubtedly the sphere in which the Roman mind from the earliest times was the most active. It is nevertheless a great error to regard every beautiful ideal creation of the Roman period — the group of *Electra* and *Orestes* in the *Villa Ludovisi*, for instance — as copied from the Greek.

That the great mass of Roman works is relatively unimportant will be confessed by every one who considers the monstrous demands made on art by Roman luxury: but it would be extraordinary if, with the fulness of themes, the richness in beautiful Greek models, the presence of important artistic forces which in accordance with their productions we presuppose to have been active in the domain of history; in the domain of the ideal, among many unimportant things, some truly important things should not have been produced.¹

Under this division, mythological representations will be separated from genre and historic, while in a third division some objects from *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii* will be considered. These have an especial interest on account of their showing forth the close connection of art with the time and circumstances of daily life.

¹ I have tried to translate this sentence literally and accurately in order to give the reader an idea of the kind of sentences in which the best of German art writers indulge. The difficulty of understanding the German language results from the fact that the language has no standards which writers are obliged to follow. Each writer uses words as he pleases, and constructs sentences as he pleases. There is moreover an inherited notion in Germany that length, complication and involution of sentences are indicative of depth and strength of thought. Prof. Overbeck of Leipzig, the leading art writer of the day, writes sentences which are many times as long as the one cited, and which no one can possibly understand on a first reading. A few German art writers are beginning to understand that mystery is not necessarily an indication of greatness, and are writing in accordance with the rules which should govern in all languages. No fault can be found with the sentences of Curtius or Conze.

Mythological Representations.

ORESTES AND ELECTRA.

148. A marble group in the Villa Ludovisi. The right arm of Orestes and the left hand of Electra are restorations.¹

This group has been variously interpreted. The name it bears was given to it by Winckelmann and is probably correct. The theme is not, however, the scene where the Electra of Sophocles recognizes her brother; for there is no moment in the poet's description to which the group corresponds. In Sophocles, Electra is passionate in her grief and equally passionate in her joy. She sobs or rejoices in most moving lines without listening to the calming words of her more self-contained brother. She does not consider the danger to which her outcries expose them, or that her conduct is jeopardizing their plan of revenge. And how could it have been otherwise when the length and the severity of the pressure is considered under which Electra has been living? The artist has admitted no trace of passion into this representation. He only shows a scene of calm and peaceful happiness, especially and most happily accentuated in the attitudes of the heads.

Though the artist undoubtedly found his conception of the subject to be in better accord with the conditions of plastic art, it must be confessed that the action alone does not explain the circumstance nor reveal the personages.

¹ Electra, who is very fully draped, stands on the right and is nearly a head taller than Orestes, about whom she places her right arm. Orestes approaches and puts his left arm about her waist. His garments go about his left shoulder and his right thigh. The restored left hand of Electra clasps the elbow of the restored right arm of Orestes. The restoration is probably correct, as it indicates the haste with which Orestes has advanced to meet his sister. The head and parts of the right arm and shoulder of Electra have been broken off and replaced.

Apart from the action, however, the group presents peculiarities that seem to be sufficient for purposes of identification. In the drama of Sophocles Electra is the real authoress of the revenge taken upon the mother; and Orestes, whom she herself has brought up, is but the implement she employs. This relationship the artist has indicated by making Orestes appear as a boy in comparison with the heroic form of his sister; and he was justified in doing so, because in the poem Electra calls him a boy. Again, Electra's short hair is indicative of grief for the terrible fate of her father Agamemnon; and in the third place — a fact upon which the artist relied, and upon which he had a right to rely — no meeting of antiquity was more celebrated than the meeting of Electra and Orestes, and no one was more likely to suggest itself to the beholder.

The inscription names as artist Menelaos, a pupil of Stephanos who was an artist of the first century of the present era. The group is undoubtedly an original work by the artist named. The idea advanced that he was but a copyist, and that the original work was of the school of Rhodes, is not to be accepted; for the work has none of that pathos which is attributed to the artists of the school of Rhodes. Apart from this, a specific Roman peculiarity is seen in the heavy drapery of Electra, and especially in the large volume of folds gathered about the lower part of the person. The large chin and the short upper lip are also indications of that taste for archaic forms which manifested itself during the early Roman period.¹

¹ This group is very interesting for a number of reasons. It differs so widely in conception and in treatment from all other statues of antiquity as to indicate an entirely new art apprehension. The subject is unknown. In fact many critics are of the opinion that it was not the intention of the artist to represent any particular episode of history or of mythology, but to show forth artistically a scene of meeting or of parting; for, as Overbeck points out, though the figures from the waist up seem to be meeting, from the waist down they seem to be parting. The inscription states that the statue was executed by Menelaos, a pupil of Stephanos. The name Stephanos occurs in an

THE LAOCOON GROUP.

149. Found in 1506 during the pontificate of Julius II not far from the ruins of the Baths of Titus. Julius had

inscription on a statue in the Villa Albani, where he is also called a pupil of Pasiteles. Pasiteles is mentioned by Pliny as an artist of great ability and versatility who lived during the first century B.C., who had a school of art, and who wrote a book of five volumes descriptive of the most celebrated works of art of antiquity. The figure in the Villa Albani represents a youth standing erect with the weight of his body resting principally upon the left foot. The left hand is drawn up to the breast and the right arm hangs down by the side. The figure is entirely nude. The right arm and the left forearm are restorations. The figure is solid and recalls the school of Polycleitus. The head is small and recalls the school of Lysippus. Friederichs is of the opinion that the figure is a copy by Stephanos of a statue of a far earlier period, and that it is not an original work of the Roman period. The balance of criticism is not with Friederichs. Critics have even been led by this statue to attribute to Pasiteles and to his school the intent to work out an original style by a combination of old styles. It is claimed that the statue presents originality, and at the same time administers to the taste for the archaic in art that existed in Rome during the time of Pompey as the result of a recoil from the late and sensual Greek school. There are many repetitions of the Albani statue. It sometimes appears as a part of a group; as in the far-famed group of the Naples Museum known as Orestes and Electra, and which may have been the work that suggested the group by Menelaos in the Villa Ludovisi. In the Naples group the features and the arrangement of the hair are quite archaic, but it is very apparent that the archaism is imitated and not original. The attitude of Orestes is precisely that of the statue of the Villa Albani. Electra, who is of his size, stands by his side with her right arm about his neck and her right hand resting on his right shoulder. Her left hand is on her hip and her head is slightly bowed. The impression conveyed by her attitude is that she is intently listening to something Orestes is explaining, his plan of revenge perhaps. Electra is clothed in a double chiton, of which the outer part reaches to the waist. It is ungirdled and falls in an awkward way off the right shoulder. The folds show it to be caught and held by the right breast, an unnatural arrangement and a very ugly motive. The comparatively modern character of the work is sufficiently revealed by the drapery. It displays none of the simplicity or quaintness of the archaic, and only succeeds in being odd while trying to appear old.

The same figure appears in a group in the Louvre; where, however, Orestes is in consultation with a male, probably Pylades. The bronze Apollo of the Naples Museum is another example. It also sometimes appears with wings as a Cupid.

It cannot be asserted that there may not be an early, and a great,

it placed in the Belvedere of the Vatican where it has ever since remained. Michael Angelo attempted to restore the right arm of the father but did not finish his work. Under Clement VII Montorsoli, a pupil of Michael Angelo, effected a restoration which was subsequently removed. The present right arm, which is only in stucco, is by Cornachini, a sculptor of the 17th century. The restoration is not correct; for according to an old copy in Naples the arm was not stretched out so straight but was bent in such a way that the hand was near the back of the head. In Michael Angelo's design the arm is also much more bent than as restored. The effect would be far better if the arm were more bent; for then the general outline would be pyramidal, and the summit of the pyramid would be the father's head. The right arm of the younger son and the right hand of the elder son are also in plaster and are also the work of Cornachini.

According to the story; while the priest Laocoon was offering a sacrifice, he and his two sons were strangled by two serpents which had been sent forth to execute divine punishment. The father, therefore, appears with his head bound with the fillet of his sacred office; and the sons are to be regarded as his attendants at the sacrifice. The altar about which the three are grouped intensifies the horrible interest by making the circumstances of the tragedy more real. It is also of the greatest use in the composition from an artistic point of view; for it makes possible the attitude of the father and allows the heads of the two sons to be brought to about the same level, an essential point for the symmetry of the group. It will be observed that the sons are quite small in comparison with the father. A similar disproportion exists in the Niobe group and is evidently for the purpose of making the

original back of all these statues; but it is more likely that Pasiteles hit upon a type that took the fancy of his day, and that he made the most of it. None of the figures are attractive as works of art, and the taste that produced them was probably of short duration.

principal figure more conspicuous. The three figures represent three different moments, the three acts of the catastrophe. The eldest son is still unhurt. In his case escape seems still possible. The scene would have been too terrible if the condition of all three had been represented hopeless. This mitigation of extreme horror is further increased by the fact that this elder son is not so much occupied with his own danger as with the greater danger of his father; for towards him are directed his complaining face and gesture.¹ The motive introduces the elements of love and of youthful sympathy into the overwhelming mass of the terrible. It works as do the scenes in the Niobe group where youthful affection is displayed. It is all the more necessary here as the scene is so much the more terrible.²

In Laocoon himself is seen the highest tension of every possible force to free himself from the coils of the serpents. The serpents, by the manner in which they seize and hold their victim, and then proceed to destroy him by their bite, show that they understand the duty with which they have been entrusted; and that they are carrying out the decrees of a higher power.³

¹ The mitigation of which Friederichs speaks is not very apparent. The right hand of the elder son is modern; so that the particular gesture he was making can only be conjectured. The spectator who is acquainted with the story knows that he cannot escape; and, apart from the story, he seems very firmly held by one arm and by one leg. In fact the serpent which holds him has secured him and will finish him after having finished the father. The expression of this son's face is not one of sympathy with his father's extremity; but he is calling upon his father for help and is horrified to perceive that his father is not in a condition to render assistance. He is not in the very throes of death as is his father; but there is no possibility of escape. The fact that his death is sure though comparatively remote is no mitigation: on the contrary the motive is a device to intensify the cruelty of the scene.

² I fail to see in the group any mitigating elements. I believe it to have been the intention of the artists to horrify; their sole intention, to which they brought the highest resources of sculpture. I therefore agree with those who refer the work to the most cruel age of which history has left definite records; that is, the age of the Roman empire.

³ Rather a far-fetched criticism. The snakes are anacondas and

The coils about his legs have brought Laocoon down upon the altar, and the straining of the muscles of the legs shows the terrible effort he is making to regain an upright position.¹

The breast is expanded to the uttermost: the arms are engaged in the effort to keep the other snake from the body; and the head, as necessitated by the action of the breast, is thrown violently upward and backward.²

The agonized efforts of the father appear all the stronger in contrast with the younger son in whose figure resistance is at an end. His legs give way. He turns his face to his father with an expression of utter hopelessness, and his effort to remove the serpent's head from his side are weak and pitiable. In contrast to the wonderful picture of heroic opposition offered by the figure of the father this figure offers a picture of pure and unalloyed rest. As artists of this work Pliny names Agesander, Athenodorus and Polydorus, of Rhodes. As the time when they flourished is not distinctly mentioned by Pliny the period of the statue is not known. From the time of Winckelmann this period has been in dispute, and it continues to furnish one of the liveliest questions of classic artistic criticism. On the one side the Laocoon is referred to the school of Rhodes which is supposed to have flourished during the century that succeeded the Alexandrian period. Those who hold to this view maintain that the notion is strictly in accordance with a proper apprehension of the development of Greek art. The same claim is made by those who refer the group to the Roman period. These also find confirmation for their position in a certain clause of Pliny's narra-

should not bite to begin with. And how is the bite that a snake bites for himself to be distinguished from the bite he bites for another party?

¹ Another and a better notion advanced by Prof. Overbeck will be found in a subsequent note.

² In reference to the face Friederichs quotes a few sentences from Winckelmann. The entire paragraph from which the sentences are taken will be found later.

tive. After stating that the group is in the palace of Titus, Pliny adds: "The artists made from one block" (an evident error): "the father, the children, and the wonderful coils of the snakes *de concili sententia*." If these words *de concili sententia* be translated *according to the determination of their deliberations*, as those would translate it who refer the group to the school of Rhodes, then the words contain a mere truism which no one would have thought of adding to the sentence. If, on the other hand, the words be translated *according to the judgment of the committee*, more probably the correct translation, then reference is to the committee having charge of the embellishments of Titus' palace and the clause fixes the group as of the Roman period. This imperial committee, as seems to be Pliny's meaning, selected these artists as the ablest artists to whom the execution of a work could be intrusted of which the subject had already been selected and which was to be executed for the decoration of a particular building. Nor are there any reasons of an artistic character to prevent the group being assigned to the Roman period; for the period of the Roman emperors possessed sufficient artistic ability to produce it, as is abundantly proved by the excellence of works which can be assigned to no other period.

The partisans of the Rhodian period are fond of calling attention to the supposed resemblances between the Laocoon and the Farnese Bull, claiming that when resemblances are so strong and so numerous the same time and the same school must be presupposed. If, however, the two groups are carefully studied and compared differences will be found to be strong and palpable and resemblances weak and remote. In the Farnese group there is such richness of accessories that the work produces the effect of a picture. In the Laocoon, on the contrary, there is even a meagreness of detail, and accessories are limited to those demanded by absolute necessity. The figure of Antiope, in the Farnese group, necessitated by faulty composition, makes the faulty

incomplete; but it is still accepted as a standard poetical translation. The earliest description of the group, subsequent to its discovery in 1506, is by Sadolet,* the pope's librarian. This most excellent descriptive poem is so rarely published that I give it entire as it appears in the edition of Lessing's *Laocoon*, published with notes and a French translation by A. Courtin, Paris, 1866:—

Ecce alto terræ e cumulo, ingentisque ruinæ
Visceribus, iterum reducem longinqua reduxit
Laocoonta dies; aulis regalibus olim
Qui stetit, atque tuos ornabat, Tite, penates.
Divinæ simulacrum artis, nec docta vetustas
Nobilius spectabat opus, nunc celsa revisit
Exemptum tenebris redivivæ mœnia Romæ.
Quid primum summumve loquar? miserumne parentem
Et prolem geminam? an sinuatos flexibus angues
Terribili aspectu? caudasque irasque draconum
Vulneraque at veros, saxo moriente, dolores?
Horret ad hæc animus, mutaque ab imagine pulsat
Pectora, non parvo pietas commixta tremori.
Prolixum bini spiris glomerantur in orbem
Ardentes colubri, et sinuosis orbibus errant,
Ternaque multiplici constringunt corpora nexu.
Vix oculi sufferre valent, crudele tuendo
Exitium casusque feros: micat alter, et ipsum
Laocoonta petit, totumque infraque supraque
Implicat et rabido tandem ferit ilia morsu.
Connexum refugit corpus, torquentia sese
Membra, latusque retro sinuatum a vulnere cernas,
Ille dolore acri, et laniatu impulsus acerbo,
Dat gemitum ingentem, crudosque evellere dentes
Connixus, lævam impatiens ad terga Chelydri
Objicit: intendunt nervi, collectaque ab omni
Corpore vis frustra summis conatibus instat.
Ferre nequit rabiem, et de vulnere murmur anhelum est.
At serpens lapsu crebro redeunte subintrat
Lubricus, intortoque ligat genua infima nodo.
Absistunt suræ, spirisque prementibus arctum
Crus tumet, obsepto turgent vitalia pulsu,
Liventesque atro distendunt sanguine venas.
Nec minus in natos eadem vis efferæ sævit
Implexuque angit rapido, miserandaque membra
Dilacerat, jamque alterius depasta cruentum
Pectus, suprema genitorem voce cientis,
Circumjectu orbis, validoque volumine fulcit.

Alter adhuc nullo violatus corpora morsu,
 Dum parat adducta caudam divellere planta,
 • Horret ad adspectum miseri patris, hæret in illo,
 Et jam jam ingentes fletus, lachrymasque cadentes
 Anceps in dubio retinet timor. Ergo perenni
 Qui tantum statuistis opus jam laude nitentes,
 Artifices magni (quanquam et melioribus actis
 Quæritur æternum nomen, multoque licebat
 Clarius ingenium venturæ tradere famæ),
 Attamen ad laudem quæcunque oblata facultas
 Egregium hanc rapere, et summa ad fastigia niti.
 Vos rigidum lapidem vivis animare figuris
 Eximii, et vivos spiranti in marmore sensus
 Inserere, aspicimus motumque iramque doloremque,
 Et pene audimus gemitus; vos extulit olim
 Clara Rhodos, vestræ jacuerunt artis honores
 Tempore ab immenso, quos rursum in luce secunda
 Roma videt, celebratque frequens: operisque vetusti
 Gratia parta recens. Quanto præstantius ergo est
 Ingenio, aut quovis extendere fata labore,
 Quam fastus et opes et inanem extendere luxum.

In the absence of a poetical transcription the following bald prose rendering may suffice:—

"See Laocoon coming from the depths of the earth, from the ruins of thy palace, O Titus, where for so many centuries he had remained buried. This masterpiece of a divine art, object of the highest admiration of a learned antiquity, snatched from darkness, now revisits the lofty walls of modern Rome. How shall I commence, how finish? Shall I speak of the unhappy father and of his two sons; or of the reptiles, their tortuous coils, their terrifying aspect? Shall I depict their long folds, their fury, their bite and the living suffering of the dying marble? At the view of this silent image I draw back seized with horror and filled with the deepest emotions of pity. The gleaming serpents unfold their coils in vast circles; they advance in sinuous orbs and strangle the three bodies in their many folds. The eye can hardly bear the sight of so horrible a fate, so ferocious a destiny. Suddenly one serpent gleams about Laocoon. It has wrapped him hand and foot and fastens on his side with its venomous

bite. The enchained body shrinks within itself; the limbs twist, the flank shivers away from the bite. Conquered by the pain of the cruel lacerations, Laocoon cries aloud in his efforts to remove the serpent's fangs. He seizes the monster convulsively, his muscles strain themselves. In vain all the forces of his body concentrate themselves in a final effort. The agony is unbearable. His cries grow feeble in the excess of torment. But the other serpent has fastened itself about the legs of the victim. These contract under the vice-like pressure. The veins swell with blood which the heart has no longer strength to send through them. With a rage no less ferocious this serpent fastens itself upon the children. To one, whom it holds fast in its coils, it has already given the fatal bite. He dies calling to his father with his last breath. The other, still unbitten, seeks to free his foot from the coil that binds it. He is frozen with horror at the sight of his unhappy father on whom his eyes are fixed. He cries aloud with tears in the terror of a double fear, his own and his father's. O, illustrious artists whom this has rendered immortal! you might indeed have transmitted your fame to us in a work less harrowing, but the subject once selected it is glorious to work it out to perfection. You have succeeded in putting living figures into inanimate stone. We see motion, rage, grief; we almost hear the groans. Centuries ago, Rhodes knew and honored you; for centuries have the honors of your art been hidden. Rome now sees them and honors you anew in the light of modern life. How much nobler is it to devote one's energies to the development of talent than to waste them in the service of pomp and luxury!"

Sadolet's descriptive powers are strong; his criticism just. The execution of the group is beyond praise, the rendition of the conception perfect; but the subject is too painful. One regrets with Sadolet that such wonderful powers should not have been employed with some less harrowing theme.

At different times and in different places three pedestals have been found which may throw some further light on the subject of the authorship of the group. They all bear this inscription, in Greek of course: "Athenodorus, son of Agesandros of Rhodes, made it," *ἐποίησε*, the aorist; the inscriptions referring undoubtedly to statues that were placed on the pedestals. Here are two of the names given by Pliny, and mentioned in the relationship of father and son. It is at least a pardonable supposition that these inscriptions and Pliny's account refer to the same artists. If we may go still further and suppose the third artist mentioned by Pliny, "Polydorus," to be another son, or perhaps a young pupil of Agesandros, we may understand better how the work could have been done, "consili sententia," accepting the words in their simple meaning; for the father alone would have received the mandate and have designed the group, the sons only assisting in the execution. This theory is strengthened by the fact that the technique of Laocoon is superior to that of the children; in which may be seen the workmanship of sons or pupils.

Dr. Brunn, a celebrated German archæologist, regards the inscriptions on the pedestals as copies of earlier inscriptions. This he infers from the large size of the letters; for all original inscriptions are modestly small and in diminutive letters. Still the use of the word "made," — "*ἐποίησε*" the aorist, — would be an argument against the very great antiquity even of the original inscriptions. For in earlier times artists are supposed to have used the imperfect "was making," — "*ἐποίει*" — indicating that a work of art should never be considered finished.

Winckelmann, who wrote in the middle of the 18th century, is rightly regarded as the father of modern art criticism. His manner of conducting investigations and his methods of arriving at conclusions still prevail, though all his standards are no longer accepted; for when he

lived the marbles of the Parthenon were unknown to civilization. The question of the date of the Laocoon he treats superficially. He assigns it to the time of Alexander the Great; as an examination of such statues as were then offered for inspection had convinced him that the most excellent were of that period. Of the group itself he thus writes in his "History of the Fine Arts among the Greeks," which appeared in 1766: "It is a statue representing the intensest pain against which the sufferer is endeavoring to rally the resources of his soul. Torture swells his muscles and contracts his nerves; but the strength of the spirit is seen in his brow. His breast heaves with agony and is rigid with the effort to repress it. The violence and still more violent repression of his cry lay bare his flank and almost expose the tumult in his entrails. His own suffering seems to torture him less than that of his children who turn to their father and cry for help. The father's heart shows itself in the desponding eye, which seems to swim with pity. His face is complaining more than crying and is still turned to heaven for help. His mouth is full of sadness; the under lip is heavy with it. The upper lip and nostrils are full of pain. At the brow is the point where pain and repression unite in conflict. Pain raises the brow in the centre of the forehead; determination draws it down at the sides." In an article published by Winckelmann at about the same time occurs this passage: "The general characteristics which distinguish the finest works of Greek art are a noble simplicity and a tranquil grandeur in attitude and expression. As the depths of the sea are always calm however agitated may be the surface; so in the works of Greek art, whatever passion may be uppermost, we are aware of the existence of a self-mastering spirit. This spirit shows itself in the midst of the violent sufferings of the Laocoon. The agony that twists the muscles and strains the tendons produces no violence in his countenance nor in his attitude. He utters no such cry as Virgil forces from his Laocoon. His mouth indi-

cates rather a suppressed sigh of agony. Physical suffering and grandeur of soul are equally and harmoniously distributed over the whole body. Laocoon suffers, but suffers as the Philoctetes of Sophocles. His sufferings pierce our soul but inspire the desire to be able to bear suffering as he does." This passage is celebrated in the history of literature for having provoked the opposition of Lessing, who in his work entitled "Laocoon" not only confutes many of Winckelmann's views but lays down for the instruction of all generations the æsthetical rules which govern exclusively in the arts of design as distinguished from those which govern in the art of poetry. Winckelmann's reference to Philoctetes was unfortunate. He is the most clamorous of Grecian heroes, to all of whom Greek poets accord the privileges of most emphatic expression of either rage, pain, or grief. In Homer the gods themselves cry out. Venus shrieked when wounded. When Diomedes reaches Mars with his spear,

"The furious god uttered a cry as of ten thousand men
rushing to the fight;
The Greeks and Trojans stood apart with fear,
To hear that terrible cry of him whose thirst
Of bloodshed never is appeased by blood."

Lessing's general charge against Winckelmann is that he applies to other arts the rules which govern alone in sculpture and applies to sculpture rules which govern alone in other arts. Lessing also differs from Winckelmann as to the period to which the Laocoon is to be assigned, considering it a work of the time of the Roman emperors. Ennius Quirinus Visconti, a learned Roman who wrote at the time of the first Napoleon, and whose books give him a high place in the list of art historians and critics, adds his testimony to that of Lessing, also assigning the group to the time of the Roman emperors. In 1797, Goethe, who bothered himself little with the question of date, wrote his opinion of the group. In it is this notion: "Rightly to apprehend the

intention of the Laocoon, place yourself at a proper distance from it, then quickly shut and open the eyes. The whole marble will appear in motion. You will fear when you look again to find the entire group changed. I might compare it to a fixed flash of lightning, to a wave turned to stone as it dashes against the shore." Further along Goethe adds: "To understand the action of the father as well in the whole body as in its several parts let the instantaneous sensation of the serpent's bite be regarded as the chief cause of every motion. The serpent has not bitten, it bites; and that too in that sensitive part of the body just above and back of the hip where the slightest irritation is keenly felt and a tickling even leads to motions similar to those we see here produced by the bite. The body contracts and draws itself away to the other side; the shoulder is pulled down, the breast projects, the head inclines to the wounded side. As in the legs and arms there is still a residue of the energy of the resistance that preceded the bite there results in the whole body a combination of struggling and yielding, of action and suffering, of effort and pain, impossible under any other conditions. Direct the bite to any other part and you will be lost in astonishment at the skill of the artist in placing it where he did. The entire attitude would be changed and artistic effect lost. This then is the idea; physical action of the human body, of which the artist shows us the physical cause. From the point of the bite, I repeat it, proceeds the force that controls the action of the limbs, the contraction of the body, the bending of the loins, the projection of the breast, and the sinking of the head and shoulders. Even the action of the features themselves is determined by this sudden, unexpected, agonizing wound." This wound theory, as it may be called, of Goethe, was passively accepted by the Germans until it was attacked but a few years ago by Overbeck; not the great Munich painter, but Johannes Overbeck, professor of the History of the Fine Arts at the University of Leipzig. Overbeck's

opinion is that the action of Laocoon is not directed to any one purpose, such as freeing his body from the serpent, nor is it the result of any one cause, such as a bite in a particular part; but consists in the agonizing, purposeless movements that mark the extremity of suffering. Pain has driven the will from its throne. The members through which the serpent's venom is moving struggle convulsively. In the face alone lingers the spirit of the man calling Heaven to witness to the injustice of his fate. In amplification of this idea Overbeck calls attention to the action of the limbs. The left leg is full of the most intense muscular action, directed apparently to no particular object. The leg is not being used to raise the body; for the foot is not placed firmly against the ground, but only touches it with the toes. The same may be said of the right foot. It is not pressing downwards; the contracting muscles draw it back against the altar. In the left arm too the action is involuntary. Laocoon seizes the serpent at too great a distance from its head to remove it from his side, and the action of the muscles of the arm indicates a downward pressure rather than an outward pull. Overbeck rejects the present restorations because they are not in accordance with his theory. On the question of date he agrees with Winckelmann, at least so far as to deem it impossible that such a work could have been executed during the time of the Roman emperors.

In 1857 Heinrich Brunn published his famous history of Greek artists. It contains a most elaborate criticism of the Laocoon and an exhaustive review of the many questions it has excited. In the course of the article Brunn calls attention to the manner in which three stages of catastrophe are presented. "In the younger son on the father's right, the limbs are relapsing in death; all resistance is at an end. The left hand reaches to the serpent's head, but the motion is hopeless and without power. The elder son has not yet entered upon the struggle. If we did not know the story a hope for

his escape might be entertained. His distress is still not so great as to prevent him being chiefly occupied with his father's misery. In this son we have an indication of the condition of Laocoon when the serpent first seized him. In the other son is shown the inevitable end." Brunn also calls attention to the fact that the marble is not finished with file or scraper. The marks of the chisel are all over it, giving it a strained and dry appearance suggestive of anatomical preparations. As to the question of date Brunn substantially agrees with Overbeck.

Visconti, Schnaase, Lübke, Böttiger the late, and Konze the present, director of the Berlin Museum are but a few of those who have contributed to Laocoon literature.

In regard to the critics one thing must be said. It is possible to destroy æsthetical impressions by a too intent and minute study of the object exciting the impression. Let the art-student pursue no investigation when the artistic sense has ceased to be primarily and chiefly affected. The archæologist and the philologist should be on the best of terms with the artistic investigator; but the latter should be on his guard not to be drawn away by a show of better order, or by a promise of better systematized and formulated laws than those which govern in his own domain. If a work of art be not so attractive that its beauty or its grandeur excite the desire to know its history, its history will not administer to the artistic sense. In German art-criticism there is displayed great power of investigation and a wealth of learning, but there is little artistic fervor. The object investigated is secondary, regarded as an object to be investigated rather than as one to be enjoyed. The same elaboration of investigation is directed to all objects alike. The critics criticise criticism with the same persistency with which they study original facts. The Laocoon has come to be regarded in Germany as a species of test subject for art writers. In Rathgeber's Laocoon, a new contribution, there are actually fifty closely written pages set apart

under the name "Schlangen-Buch," serpent's book, in which snakes are considered from every possible point of view, and quotations are made from a variety of languages to show in what light snakes were regarded by nations at various periods of their history. All of which is supposed to assist in appreciating the Laocoon; and it is not impossible to conceive of an art school in Germany where Rathgeber would be a study, and not an optional one either. — *Ed.*]

THE NILE.

150. A marble statue found during the pontificate of Leo X not far from the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. So many objects have been found at various times near this spot which are either Egyptian in style or Egyptian in subject that it is inferred that hereabouts must have stood a temple of Isis. The statue was removed to the Vatican by Clement XIV and restored by Casper Sibilla.¹

The restorations of the figure of the Nile itself are few and unimportant. The right hand is new with the ears of grain it holds, while the heads of the ears are antique. The children who surround the river-god are, however, much restored. The upper parts of all of them are new and, of many, quite a portion of the rest of the figure. The correctness of all of these restorations may be questionable, but the original motive seems well preserved.

The god, who on account of the size and the importance of the stream which he represents could only be rendered in massive proportions, reclines on his left side with his arm on a sphinx, the symbol of Egypt. In the left hand he holds a large cornucopia filled with flowers and fruit; in his right, both fruit and grain: all the gift of his nour-

¹ A sculptor who distinguished himself in the service of the church during the first half of the eighteenth century. During the time of the French revolution and under Napoleon the statue sojourned for a while in Paris with its companion piece the Tiber. The Tiber is still in the Louvre.

ishing waters. From near the smaller end of the cornucopia waters gush forth and cover all the sides of the base. The stream seems to start from under the garments of the god, as if in allusion to the unknown source of the great river. In the children who are all about are to be recognized, according to classic authority, the units of measurement of the height of the overflow of the river. This idea is indicated more clearly by placing the little ones at graduated elevations. Their number, sixteen, is supposed to correspond to the highest measurement to which the overflow reaches. The position and grouping of the children were in a measure necessitated by the manner in which the god reclines upon his four-sided bed. About the empty places to the right and left the children are of course more thickly gathered. On the right, clustering up and down and about the sphinx and the cornucopia, they seem to lead up to the little chap who, highest of all, sits in serene complacency with folded arms on the very top of the cornucopia itself. The folded arms are of course the restorer's notion, a happy idea to express the comfortable satisfaction of a full harvest safely garnered. The children on the left are playing with a crocodile. Two in the centre have an ichneumon which seems disposed to "go" for the crocodile. The other children are disposed along the right arm and leg of the main figure; so that the colossal god is girt with the lively little figures that play all about him like splashing waves; without, however, at all interfering with the majesty of the impression he produces.

The statue was undoubtedly so placed that it could be seen from all sides. This is evident from the base, which on three sides is adorned with reliefs carrying out still further the ideas suggested by the statue. Here the fabled inhabitants of the Nile are set forth in most lively manner. The front of the base is without relief; the object being, as in the Farnese Bull, not to distract attention from the principal view of the work.

Beginning at the left hand corner, the relief sets forth

in many groups the fightings of the crocodiles and the hippopotami. The stork-like figure of Isis occurs. Then in boats are the comic dwarf-like forms of the Pygmies; while at the extreme end of the frieze, on the right side of the base and as if in contrast to the terrible things the river hides, a pasturing cow reposes in peace on the banks.

This is the most beautiful representation of a river-god preserved from antiquity, and it is therefore of great value in conveying a clear idea of the classic conception of such divinities. The point most apparent is that the god is not conceived of as a deity apart and separate from the element he represents, but as forming a part of it. This is seen in the attitude, which is heavy, and in the muscles which appear as if they were unaccustomed to exertion. It seems as if the god could not stand upright. The idea of unity with the water is further seen in the flowing hair, and in a certain unsteadiness of expression suggestive of the unsteadiness of the flowing of the stream.

As to the period to which the statue is to be assigned the question can only be between two periods, the Alexandrian and the best of the Roman period. If it was executed at the same time that its companion piece, the Tiber, was executed it must, of course, be Roman.¹

¹ This statue does not attract the attention it deserves. It is very charming. The harmony between the dignity of the god and the lively sportiveness of the children is delightfully rendered. There is no interference, but a perfect blending. To carry out to perfection so delightful a conception indicates genius and skill of the highest order. I should not hesitate to assign the work to the very best period of Greek art; that is, the original work; for I am inclined to consider the Vatican statue a copy, as it is not free from technical defects that betray the copyist. Of all the cities of the post-Alexandrian period Alexandria was certainly the foremost; and it is singular that no authentic example of its sculpture should have been preserved. This statue may have originated at Alexandria, and may convey an idea of the character of the sculpture of that renowned city.

The figure of the Tiber in the Louvre is very similar in composition, but the absence of the children deprives it of the sprightliness and of the charming vivacity of the other work. The god partially reclines on his right side. His right arm rests on a rock. In his right hand he holds a cornucopia and in his left, a rudder. The cornucopia is filled with fruit and flowers and contains an object that looks like a

THE BORGHESE MARS OF THE LOUVRE.

151. A marble statue from the Borghese collection; since 1808 in the Louvre. The left forearm, which undoubtedly held a spear, is modern; also the fingers of the right hand.¹ There is in existence a group in which an identical figure appears with Venus. The massive proportions are further evidence that the figure is intended to be Mars and no other. The wolves on the helmet are additional proof; for the wolf was sacred to the god of war.

The ring about the ankle defines the situation in which the god is conceived. It is so conspicuous that it must have an especial meaning and cannot be a superfluous addition which could be removed without sacrificing the motive of the work. It is to be regarded as a fetter. The idea of restraint is also conveyed by the despondent expression of the whole figure. The figure is Mars fettered by Vulcan and overcome with shame at the disastrous outcome to his lover's enterprise.

Some critics have called the figure Achilles, apparently

cake. By the right hand of the god reclines the she-wolf suckling the infant Romulus and Remus. Water seems trickling from the hair and beard of the god and is flowing all about the base of the statue.

There are also reliefs on three sides of the base as in the other work. Beginning at the right is the royal residence at Alba Longa and the famous white sow suckling her thirty pigs. Then follow two colossal figures up to their waists in water, swimming or wading towards a third, smaller, and apparently female, figure seated on the bank. Then follow fishermen; then three boats, the first one being pulled along the stream, the second one being shoved off from the shore, and the third one being loaded. On the third side are cattle, etc., browsing. The composition is clumsy and its meaning obscure. The whole work is so destitute of originality as to be an argument for the Greek origin of its companion piece.

¹The figure is over six feet high and is nude with the exception of a helmet and a ring about the right ankle. The head is turned a little to the right and is slightly bowed. The left forearm is partially raised, while the right hangs down. The gesture of the right hand and the inclination of the head were probably to call attention to the ring about the right ankle. On the sides of the helmet are two griffins; and on the raised vizor, two wolves.

forgetting the Achilles of Greek poetry; for how can the youthful Achilles, the hero who was swift of foot, be recognized in this desponding and heavy figure? Especially absurd is the situation assigned by these critics to the figure; for they imagine Achilles in the act of being armed to revenge the death of Patroclus. How different would the Achilles of Homer appear at such a moment; he whom even the sight of weapons threw into a warlike frenzy, whom revenge absorbed, whom no instant could keep away from conflict!

The figure is of Roman origin, as is proved by the wolves on the helmet; for wolves were symbolical of the Roman Mars only. The comparatively short legs also indicate Roman work. A Greek original may have suggested the statue; but even then the original cannot have been of the best period, for Mars as a captive is a late conception.¹

¹ Both Clarac and Visconti call the statue Achilles. Visconti advances many reasons in support of his opinion. (Monumenti Schelti Borghesiani, p. 33, et seq.) The strong point in favor of Achilles is the long hair. In no statue where Mars is represented as a youth does he appear with long hair. The statue may represent Achilles sadly contemplating his fate. The ring may not be a fetter but of the nature of a protection to his only vital spot; and Achilles may be sad because he knows that the protection will be worthless. The statue cannot be called heavy. Though the proportions are large and the muscles massive, the statue conveys a wonderful sense of quick and agile power. No other statue of antiquity conveys such a sense of power to perform on the instant any extreme physical act with absolute ease. This extraordinary peculiarity, showing the very greatest skill, must refer the work to some celebrated original of the best period of art. Pausanias speaks of a temple of Mars that stood near a statue of Demosthenes. Within the temple was a statue of Mars by Alcamenes. The massiveness of the statue recalls the early part of the Phidian period, and the original conception cannot have been unworthy of so great an artist as Alcamenes. Pausanias adds that in the same temple of Mars were two statues of Venus. If the Greeks saw nothing incongruous in putting statues of Venus in temples of Mars, there was probably nothing in their religion to take offence at a god of war in the fix represented in the statue. The Greeks and their religion must be regarded from their own point of view and not from the point of view of modern thought and modern religious apprehensions. There was no period of Greek history when Greek religion could not be sportive.

ENDYMION.

152. A marble statue found in 1783 in the ruins of Hadrian's villa on the Tiber. After belonging to several owners it was finally sold to Gustavus III, of Sweden. It is now in the Royal Museum of Stockholm. The calf of the right leg, the right hand, the left foot, the left cheek, the chin, the lips, and the point of the nose, are restorations by Giovanni Grossi. The statue also presents the appearance of having been worked over.¹ From many similar representations on reliefs and gems there can be no doubt that Endymion, the beautiful sleeper, is the subject of this work. His slumber is here more gentle and tender than in any other of his representations. Peaceful and quiet slumber is most beautifully and truly rendered. As the figure of Endymion is used on tombs to typify the sleep of death it may be that this statue originally decorated a tomb, though the place where it was found would not suggest the idea. The composition must be older than the time of Hadrian. The Pompeian frescoes, which are older, present a similar figure; nor has the statue any of those petty decorative elegancies which distinguish works of Hadrian's time. There is, however, nothing to indicate to how much earlier a period the statue may be assigned.²

¹ The statue represents a young man fast asleep. His shoulders are partially sustained by a rock on which his head is thrown back. His right knee is slightly drawn up and his right hand rests on an elevation. He is entirely nude with the exception of two bits of the mantle on which he sleeps. These come over the shoulders and are fastened on the right breast by a brooch. I know nothing of Giovanni Grossi. The name is not given in Nagler's *Künstler-Lexicon*.

² As I have seen only the plaster cast of this statue I am not able to pass judgment on its merits; but the cast certainly does not show any of the grace and gentle beauty of which Friederichs speaks. The subject is not particularly attractive, nor is the artist's conception of it free from grossness. This impression may be partially owing to the size of the statue; for it must be about eight feet long. There is a repetition of it in the Vatican, and there is said to be another in the British Museum. In the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican is a statue of

THE LOUVRE GENIUS OF ETERNAL REPOSE.

(From Fröhner's Catalogue of the ancient sculpture of the Louvre, No. 493.)

153. A naked youth, crowned with poppies, stands against the trunk of a tree. His legs are crossed, and his arms are crossed on top of his head which leans gently towards his left shoulder. Long curling locks fall on his breast. His eyes, half closed, convey the idea that he is falling asleep. This figure, of which the graceful pose, the charming abandon, the sweet and melancholy expression merit the highest praises, represents the genius of death; for death is but a beautiful sleep.

The same motive is found on a sarcophagus of the Vatican, except that on the Vatican sarcophagus drapery is suspended to the tree, and at the foot of the composition is a mask and a small Cupid pointing to it with a torch.¹

Diana also found at Hadrian's Villa, and with which the statue of Endymion may very well have been grouped. It represents Diana with her head gently bowed and with her hands outstretched rapturously gazing at her sleeping lover. The forearms are modern, but the restoration is in admirable keeping with the motive and is undoubtedly correct. The head, though antique, is not the original. The attitude is very graceful and the statue points to an original of great excellence. The two are probably copied from a famous group of a very good period of Greek art.

The sarcophagi of the Roman period on which Endymion appears as the representative of the gentle sleep of death are numerous. On many of them Endymion is represented sleeping in the arms of Morpheus, while Diana, alighting from her chariot, is led towards him by sympathetic Cupids. Sometimes a figure is introduced to represent Mount Latmus. The execution of these scenes is poor, but there are sometimes figures in the scene that suggest excellent originals. None of the fifty daughters of the pair appear; nor is Endymion sleeping with his eyes open, as some of the poets narrate.

¹ The statue is of Pentelic marble; but it is of the Roman period as is shown by the fact that the pupils of the eyes are indicated. This is one of the statues that belonged to the collection of the Cardinal Mazarin, and was one of those which were left by him to the Duc de Meilleraye who took the arms and the name of the Cardinal; and who, when he got the statues, did with his own hands a lot of smashing to prove the absolute purity of his thoughts and his abhorrence of the nudities of Greek mythology. The statue has been

THE NIOBE SARCOPHAGUS OF THE VATICAN.

154. Found near Rome during the last century in a vineyard belonging to the Casile family; presented by Cardinal Casile to Pius VI, and by him placed in the Vatican. The left arm of Apollo with the bow, and the right arm of Diana with the arrow, are modern.

The relief on the front of the sarcophagus is rich in beautiful motives which are, however, not original with the artist. The right half is occupied by the sons; the left by the daughters including the mother who holds a

broken in two, and all the front part of it has been banged and battered. It was so mutilated that at one time it passed for an Hermaphrodite. The restorations are good and the statue is recognized as a work of excellent art. Whether the original composition was of Greek or of Roman art cannot as yet be determined. On the Vatican sarcophagus there is a figure at either end. (Visconti, Museo Pio-Clementino, Tav. 13.) These figures are quite similar to the Paris statue except as indicated by M. Fröhner. The tree is supposed to indicate the Elysian Fields; the garments, the human life that has been laid aside; and the mask, the disguises that may have formed a part of that life and which can no longer conceal. The whole system of imagery found on Roman sarcophagi is complicated and not in accord with any notions of the faith or the morality of the times; generally displaying a heterogeneous combination and a confused jumbling of notions from Greek mythology and Greek tradition. The contrast between Greek tombs of the best period and the sarcophagi of the Roman period is most striking and most suggestive. Two of the largest, finest, and best preserved of Roman sarcophagi were found in 1805 not far from Bordeaux, and are now in the Louvre in Paris. They are fully described by Fröhner, Nos. 240 and 426 of his catalogue. One represents the story of Bacchus and Ariadne and the other the story of Diana and Endymion. There are additions and embellishments that destroy unity and which make the works uninteresting to the art-student, except in so far as they show the manner in which art went to pieces during the second and third centuries of the present era. Nothing shows more clearly than Roman sarcophagi that when they were executed all notion of the unity of divinity, or of the personal individuality of divinities, had been completely lost.

A marked distinction between the funereal sculpture of Greece and Rome is that the latter is materialistic. Often in the centre of the relief on a Roman sarcophagus will be introduced a medallion of the deceased. Or on top of the sarcophagus will be his bust or his full-length figure reclining. In Greek funereal sculpture, on the contrary, portraiture has not been recognized, and both figures and scenes are not real but symbolical.

dead daughter in her arms. On either side of the sarcophagus is also a smaller relief. On one side are two sons and a horse; on the other, two daughters. The horse-may indicate that the sons were engaged in hunting when their fate overtook them; a notion further indicated by one of the sons in the front relief who holds two hunting-spears in his hand.

With the children are, as usual, a nurse and a pedagogue. The nurse is the same old woman who always appears. She stoops down to raise a fallen maiden; while the youngest son runs to the pedagogue. As in actual life servants and teachers, if not actually slaves, were both from the ranks of the humble; so in art they are represented with unattractive features and in poor attire. The outer garment of the pedagogue is the skin worn by herdsmen and rustics.

The chief difference between the relief and the Florentine statues is that the mother is not made prominent either by size or by position. The same thing appears in all Niobe sarcophagi reliefs as a result of the object for which they were executed. In funereal sculpture myths were not employed for themselves, but as references to actual occurrences. For instance, on the tombs of boys and maidens those myths were sculptured which set forth the idea of the terror of death in the midst of youth and beauty. For such a purpose the myths of Meleager and of Adonis were used; the story of the Leucippides and of Proserpina; and, in the same intent, the fate of the Niobes. The children and their fate are, therefore, the object to be emphasized; and the prominent position which the mother has in the Florentine statues could not be given her.¹ The relief, also, shows a more intense and passionate character than the Florentine statues. The garments flutter more wildly. The positions are more violent though not without beauty. One daughter

¹ An additional and an artistic reason is the difficulty of making any one figure prominent in a relief, and especially in a relief of limited dimensions.

in her agony bends herself over backwards while a brother on his knees in front of her hides his face behind his arm as if he could not bear the terrible sight. The technique of the relief accords with this extreme character. Some figures spring forth so far from the background that they are almost in the round. The action throughout is so wild that no idea of decoration is suggested. The realistic, stern, and affecting art of Rome accords with this high style of relief as low relief accords with the modest and well-balanced art of Greece. The reliefs on the sides are less high. Such is the case in nearly all Roman sarcophagi; showing that the artist, in a hurry to complete his work, paid less attention to the parts which would be the less conspicuous. The figures of Apollo and Diana are from well-known types. The group of the two sons on the side occurs elsewhere as Orestes and Pylades. Further examination will show that nearly all the figures are copied. The copying, however, is not servile. It rarely, if ever, happens that a figure is reproduced in every detail. The artist is entitled to the name and was not merely a workman. He allows himself — and he had the ability to take it — a certain amount of liberty which, small as it is, gives his work life and attractiveness.

On the cover of the sarcophagus the dead bodies of the children are represented. Back of the daughters is a curtain to show that they are within the house. This curtain occurs frequently on sarcophagi, and generally merely for the purpose of ornamentation; here, however, it seems to be used for the purpose stated. Both on the cover and in the front relief there is a greater display of the nude than in the Florentine marbles. Diana also, in accordance with later taste, has one breast bare.¹

¹ A very similar sarcophagus was discovered near Rome in 1824 and is now in the Munich Glyptothek. It is smaller and of poorer execution than the Vatican specimen and differs from it in some particulars. The two are fully described in Stark's *Niobe*. A singular

THE ORESTES SARCOPHAGUS OF THE VATICAN.

155. Formerly in the Barberini palace. The head of Orestes in the scene on the right is modern. Reliefs on sarcophagi were generally divided into scenes. Here there are three; one large central scene, with a smaller one on each side of it. In the centre of the middle scene is the partially nude body of Clytemnestra whose naked breasts recall the words of the poet that the mother bared to the son who came to murder the breasts that gave him suck. To the left of Clytemnestra is Ægisthus falling headlong and backwards from his throne. Between them and straddling the lower part of Clytemnestra's body is Orestes. He is entirely nude. He faces to the left, and with his sword drawn up over his left shoulder is about to give Ægisthus a final blow. Near Orestes and back of the fallen Ægisthus is Pylades, also with a drawn sword. Near him, and distinguished by her age and by her head-dress, is the faithful nurse of Orestes. She hurries away with an expression of terror and abhorrence. To the right of Clytemnestra is squatted a figure who has the appearance of a servant. He is apparently holding up a small altar which seems falling. He may be endeavoring to prevent it from falling, or he may be endeavoring to hide himself behind it. A curtain, sus-

circumstance is that many sarcophagi of the Roman period are adorned with scenes from the life of Bacchus. As representing the fulness of immortal life to which the deceased may have obtained, such scenes may not be entirely inappropriate. Scenes of a comic or trivial nature are, however, so often introduced that a trifling with sacred subjects is suggested. There are scenes where Bacchus is being bathed by the nymphs; others where he is trying on his boots, and others of a similar character. In connection with death these scenes must have produced an unpleasant impression upon those capable of receiving impressions. There are no funereal monuments left by any civilized, or half-civilized, race that compare with those left by the Romans for hard-heartedness, lack of sympathy, and absence of hope. The wreck of Greek mythology, and its utter failure to be of any lasting good or of any permanent assistance to the human soul are better understood from sarcophagi of the period of the Roman empire than from the writings of the authors of the times.

tained on one side by a Hermes and on the other by nothing apparently, shows that the tragedy is enacted within a dwelling. Behind the curtain are seen two Eumenides who with torch and serpent are already on the trail of their victim. The scene on the right has reference to the happy termination of the story. Orestes is leaving the Delphic oracle, which is here indicated by the tripod and the laurel branch. He has a sword in his right, holds the scabbard in his left, and is stepping over one of the Eumenides on his way to Athens where he is to be freed forever from their persecutions. This scene has been criticised because Orestes is moving towards the centre; that is, towards the scene of the murder. This arrangement, however, was necessitated by the laws of composition; for if he moved away the unity of the composition would be broken. On the extreme left are three sleeping Eumenides, whose separation from the one on the right is best accounted for on the supposition that the artist took the scene from a vase on which naturally these two parts would be joined.¹

One of the three holds a double-headed axe, a singular weapon but no less singular than the swords and spears with which the Eumenides elsewhere appear. In regard to the choice of such a scene for a sarcophagus it may be said that the idea was to illustrate righteous expiation, just as the punishments of the lower world were similarly used for a similar reason. The fact that sarcophagi were manufactured in quantities and were bought ready-made may account in some way for the poor choice of subjects with which to decorate them. The separation of the Eumenides shows that the work is not the original work of an artist. Moreover the figure of Orestes appears on Greek relief and also on a gem as Cadmus in combat with a dragon.

¹ In which case, also, the motion of Orestes on the right would not appear to be towards the scene of the murder. Orestes has a mantle thrown over the left arm and is apparently holding the laurel branch himself. I could not make out the scabbard.

On the sides of the sarcophagus are sphinxes. One of them has in his claws the head of a ram. Sphinxes occur on Greek tombs and the ram's head is explained as illustrating destructive fate. Here, too, the side reliefs are much flatter.¹

MELPOMENE.

156. A colossal statue, probably found amid the ruins of Pompey's theatre; removed by Pius VI to the Vatican, and removed by Napoleon I to the Louvre in Paris, where it still remains.

The right forearm with the mask, and the fingers of the left hand, are restorations. Better preserved statues of the Muse show that the restoration of the right arm and hand is correct, and that the left hand rested on a club.

Melpomene, in order to make her attributes correspond with the nature of the poetry she represents, is shown with the mask and club of the hero who in Greek tragedy is the embodiment of heroic deeds and sufferings. The heavy sleeves and the broad girdle so close to the breasts are peculiarities of theatrical drapery. The heavy folds between the legs show that the drapery at least is of Roman origin. The head is very graceful and the face very beautiful.²

¹ The Romans must have had terrible notions of death to use such scenes to ornament the resting-places of their dead. The friends of the occupant of this sarcophagus undoubtedly had vague yet emphatic ideas of eternal damnation, and complacently regarded the deceased as in the midst of it.

² This statue, to which allusion has already been made, is one of the most interesting statues of the Louvre collection. It is especially interesting as suggestive of the dimensions within which sculpture should be restrained in order that its effects be purely artistic. It may be a question whether a statue of even this size, if placed out of doors, would not produce a bad effect. Architectural lines and forms relieve size; nature's lines do not. Nevertheless nature demands a limited colossal; for a statue of the size of life only is dwarfed when placed out of doors. And yet if an exposed statue exceed eight or ten feet in height it must have a background of architecture or the effect will be bad.

THE GIUSTINIANI MINERVA.¹

157. A marble statue of Minerva; found in Rome near the church of S. Maria sopra Minerva which, as its name implies, was built over a temple of Minerva. In the beginning of the 17th century it was in the possession of the Giustiniani family. During the time of the first Napoleon it belonged to Lucien Bonaparte. He sold it to Pius VII, who removed it to the Vatican, where it now stands in the Braccio Nuovo.

The only restorations are the right hand with the part of the spear it holds, and some few bits about the left hand. The base of the spear is antique. The sphinx on the helmet is also new with the exception of its fore-feet. The drapery has not escaped repolishing. It is not improbable that this very statue was worshipped in the temple near the ruins of which it was discovered. At all events the quiet pose and dignified attitude are appropriate to temple sculpture. It was not the intention of the artist to produce a statue of the goddess of conflict; but to represent the earnest and passionless goddess who even in the time of Homer was distinguished for her self-control.

The statue has been variously judged: by some most highly praised; by others as strongly depreciated. Zoëga is especially severe in his criticism. Certainly the drapery is overloaded with folds, and the action of the left hand, which seems to be playing with the edge of the peplos, is not well chosen. There are many repetitions of the work, and the question has arisen whether they be not all copied from some one Greek original. The

¹ The figure is colossal. Minerva stands upright; in her right her spear; her left across her person. She is very finely clothed in the Greek double chiton and in the full mantle. The mantle passes over the left shoulder, and one end of it is apparently supported by the left arm. This causes the action of the left arm to appear ordinary. A serpent glides back of her and raises itself by her right side. On top of the helmet is a sphinx, and on the visor of the helmet are two rams' heads facing each other.

drapery, however, is Roman, and the gesture of the left hand, which has no essence of the divine, is the gesture of many portrait statues of the Roman period. In some of the attributes the artist has followed Greek models. The serpent, for instance, was suggested by the Minerva of Phidias, though here it is differently arranged and is apparently fawning about the goddess. As the serpent is an attribute of the goddess of healing, this statue has been also named *Minerva Medica*. The sphinx on the helmet is another suggestion from Phidias. The rams' heads on the visor, a frequent ornament, are borrowed from battering-rams, and would seem to indicate the goddess of war.¹

THE OTTOBONI APOLLO.

158. [A singular statue; transferred from the Ottoni palace to the Vatican. It represents a standing figure clothed with chiton and peplos; the right hand partially raised and holding a helmet. The peplos, which is clasped on the right shoulder, discloses the buttoned sleeve of the chiton. The left forearm, emerging from the peplos hangs by the side and holds an olive-branch. The head is antique but not the original head. The two forearms, and large portions of the person from the left shoulder nearly to the knee, are modern. The statue is not so interesting artistically as it is as an illustration of the mistakes into which restorers easily fall.

The replaced head and the restored left breast are female; while the antique right breast and the forms of the person, so far as they can be recognized beneath the drapery, are evidently male. The statue has been restored as *Minerva Pacifera*. It was evidently an *Apollo Citharædos* and was copied from the *Apollo* so often seen on archaic relief; as when grouped with *Nike* for instance,

¹ In spite of the defects to which Friederichs calls attention, this is one of the most dignified and impressive statues of *Minerva* in existence. In pose it is even superior to the *Minerva* of Velletri.

where he holds his lyre in his left and the sacrificial cup in his right. The restorer was misled by the small antique folds which remained about the left breast. He supposed them to indicate a female breast when they only marked the spot where the lyre rested against the person. Mistakes in restoring are so common, even when the greatest artists of the times were the restorers, that no great blame should be attached to their commission nowadays. — *Ed.*]

THE VEILED HERMES OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

159. [This Hermes affords an instance of another kind of error; that is, of a long entertained mistaken identity. It represents the upper part of a youth, with a thick veil or cloak wrapped closely about his person which conceals him with the exception of the face and the hair of the forehead. The features and the form as seen beneath the cloak are evidently male, and the crisp curls are those of a young boy; yet this figure was long known and regarded as a Venus veiled and disconsolate at the death of Adonis. It was even claimed to be derived from a statue which Cinyras, the father of Adonis, is reported to have dedicated in a temple of Venus after the death of his son. The Hermes was found in 1775 not far from Tivoli; and as there are several repetitions it may be a copy of a Greek original of a good art-period. — *Ed.*]

THE POZZUOLI MARINE DIVINITY.

160. [A colossal bust found near Pozzuoli, acquired by Gavin Hamilton and by him sold to Clement XIV. The bust probably represents one of the Tritons. The hair and beard are long and flowing, and are wave-like in the manner in which they rise and fall. Two little horns grow out of the head, which is moreover adorned with vine-leaves and with grape-clusters. Beneath the chin two tiny dolphins poke their heads out through the beard.

The eyebrows are as if formed of fish-scales. The same scales appear in scallops about the breast; while before and behind on the pedestal of the bust are the waves of the sea. The expression is mild with perhaps a trace of that sadness peculiar to all sea-divinities. Friederichs supposes that the bust represents a divinity of some special part of the sea where vines grew and wine was made; some one of the bays of the Mediterranean, for instance, where wine was famous. But no such special reference seems necessary, as Tritons frequently took part in Bacchic festivals. If this charming composition is to be referred to the Roman period, as Friederichs decides, then the period had artists in whose hearts the joyful and playful spirit of Greek art burned as brightly as in the days of Praxiteles. It is one of the most charming of all the representations of the sea. — *Ed.*]

ROMAN CARYATIDES.

161. [There are in the various collections of Europe many statues of Caryatides which are assigned by critics to the late republic, or to the early empire, of the Roman period. They are of poor execution and are chiefly interesting for the contrast they furnish to the Caryatides of the Erechtheum. One of the largest, finest, and most interesting, is in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican. It represents a young woman fully clad with chiton and peplos. Her right hand crosses her person, while the left hand is near the left shoulder and apparently draws up and holds the peplos. The statue has been so much worked over, however, that the action is no longer clear. The uncertainty is increased by the fact that both hands are modern. All the restorations were designed by Thorwaldsen. It is not known where or when it was discovered, nor is it certain whether or not it originally served as a Caryatid. The drapery does not suggest architecture nor does the position of the hands harmonize with architectural lines. The basket on the head with its Corinthian ornaments is,

as far as I was able to judge, also modern. A mistake may have been made in restoring the statue as a Caryatid. It is impressive and dignified, and would appear still more impressive if the basket were removed. Several similar statues are in the Villa Albani. Two deserve mention. The first represents a young woman clothed in the chiton, over which passes and hangs from the left shoulder a species of nebris. This garment is confined about the waist with a girdle, and its lines pass from left to right as if arranged intentionally to interrupt the straight lines of the chiton. The chiton is sleeveless. The right arm is raised to the cushion on which the basket is carried; the left arm is by the side and holds the head of a thyrsus. The idea was evidently to represent a bacchante engaged in serving as a Caryatid. On the back of a cushion are the names Kriton and Nikolaos, of Athens. The names are supposed to be the names of a firm residing in Athens and engaged in the manufacture and exportation of works of art. This particular statue was found in 1776 on the Appian Way not far from the tomb of Cæcilia Metella. The resemblance of the drapery to that of the Juno Lanuvia is very apparent. According to Clarac both this statue and the next one to be mentioned were found at Frascati. The second statue is very much restored. The head, shoulders, and body to about a line with the breasts, are substantially antique. From this line to just below the knees all is modern. From the knees down is antique with the exception of the feet, which are also modern. The figure is clothed in the double chiton, of which the outer fold comes nearly down to the knees. The right arm hangs by the side, the left is raised from the elbow. About the neck are two strings of pearls. The striking peculiarity is the veil which falls behind from the top of the basket. The face is graceful and the pose strictly architectural. These statues, which are good specimens of the Caryatides of the period, may be poor copies of good Greek originals which have disappeared. They possess none of the simple dignity and

severe beauty of the Caryatides of the Erechtheum, and it is evident that in striving for effect the artists allowed themselves to take liberties with architectural ordering. There could have been no harmony between such figures and the architecture which they were created to serve. That early critics should have regarded these figures as originals of the best periods of Greek art shows how knowledge has increased and how it has been purified. — *Ed.*]

THE APOTHEOSIS OF HOMER.

162. A relief found about the middle of the 17th century on the Via Appia near the site of the ancient Bovillæ and acquired of the Colonnas in 1819 for the British Museum. The upper corners of the slab are new; also the outstretched arm with drapery of the dancing figure to the right on the upper row. In the lowest row of the relief is represented the adoration of Homer. He sits enthroned to the left, and presents a younger and more ideal appearance than is conveyed by antique busts. The roll he holds in the right hand characterizes the poet, while the sceptre in the left shows that he is king in his domain. Behind his throne and at the extreme left of the row stand two figures whom the inscriptions name Chronos and Oikumene. Inscriptions also accompany all the other figures of this row. Chronos is winged to show the rapid flight of time, and holds two rolls. These are undoubtedly the chief works of the master which are thus made to appear immortal. Oikumene is crowned with the modius as an earth-divinity. This attribute is hardly appropriate, as Oikumene does not here represent the nourishing earth but the human race which is nourished by the earth. She crowns the poet who is thus honored by the whole inhabited world. The two figures show that his renown is limited by neither time nor place. On either side of the throne kneel two youths who represent his two great works.

The one near the spectator is the Iliad, and shows the warlike character of the poem by holding a sword. On the other side, and nearly hidden by the throne, is the Odyssey holding in its hand as an appropriate emblem the ornament from the prow of a vessel. On the footstool of the throne are a mouse and a frog to represent the poet's song of the war between these animals. The worshippers who occupy the rest of the row must be regarded as personages who are conscious of their obligations to the poet, and who offer thanks in joyful recognition. Nearest to the poet, and still to the left of the altar, is a boy who represents Myth. His small size must be supposed to accord to the character. It also corresponds to the occupation in which he is engaged; for with cup and chalice he stands ready to perform the duties of the youth who serve at the sacrifice. To his right is the blazing altar; behind it, the ox to be sacrificed. The ox has a singular hump on its back, suggested perhaps to the artist by the oxen of his own country. At least it is known that such oxen were to be found in Caria, and Priene where the artist was born was not far away. To the right of the altar stands History, who has already commenced the sacrifice by dropping incense into the flames. History was no less closely related to the poet than Tradition. Each served him as a source of inspiration. Next to history is Epos, also engaged in the sacrifice. With inspired reverence she holds aloft the torches which have kindled the sacred flame. Then follow Tragedy and Comedy, each of whom has the poems of Homer so much to thank for both topic and inspiration. They each wear the long-sleeved garment of the stage. Tragedy is the larger and wears cothurnus and the bushy top-knot called *óyxos* used to impart height to the forehead. Then come four figures which are crowded together in order to balance better the other end of the row. First is the maiden-like figure of Physis, who with child-like gesture attaches herself to the others. That the little figure is female is as evident from

her garments as from the essentially female name which is inscribed beneath her. She is the personification of plan and of that creative force which in Homer receives its highest illustration. Her small size, as in the case of Telesphoros, shows that her force is germinal. Her size poetizes the germinal seed. Arete follows, but is in no way especially characterized. She represents steadfastness, or better, equity; for Homer was ever a teacher of virtue. Three figures remain and three names, Mneme, Pistis, Sophia, to be assigned to them. Sophia is probably the small figure standing in front at the end of the row. She holds her hand reflectingly to her chin. Her small size is that the figure back of her can be seen. The names of the other two are doubtful. Mneme is probably the other small figure which holds up her hand as if reflecting or recalling; so that Pistis, who represents truth and righteousness, is the tall figure back of the others. The figure of Mneme, who is the faithful conservator of tradition, holds in her hand a roll. This roll, though modern, may be copied from the antique. All the figures of this group represent those general characteristics which, according to classic opinion, were united in the highest degree in Homer and to which he gave the liveliest expression and the most varied development. The curtain of the background is to show that the rites are taking place in a temple and not in the open air.

Above this scene and in two rows are the figures of Apollo and the Muses. Apollo under the circumstances would naturally appear as Citharædos. He stands in a grotto by which the artist undoubtedly intended to represent the Corycian grotto of Mt. Parnassus. As a still closer indication the artist has placed in the grotto the Delphic round stone, regarded as the navel of the world, and near it the bow and quiver of the god. The small figure on his left who is with him in the grotto is undoubtedly a priestess, as she offers him a cup. Immediately outside the grotto and to the god's right is Polyhymnia, the most ideal of all the Muses and the one to

whom is attributed the invention of poetry. She is in the attitude ordinarily given to her by art, which here imparts to her the appearance of listening to the strains of Apollo's lyre. The other Muses are grouped in pairs in accordance with their characteristics. Next to Polyhymnia is Urania studying her globe and facing Terpsichore who is seated and who holds a large stringed instrument which hardly distinguishes her from Erato. Immediately above Terpsichore is Calliope with her tablets. She is seated to the left but turns to the right. She holds the tablets aloft with her left, and gesticulates with the right as if declaiming. Clio stands by her side, holds her dress, and turns to listen. Then follow two Muses directing their looks upward to where Jupiter is seated. They are Erato who is standing and who holds in her left a stringed instrument, and Euterpe, seated and holding aloft her flutes in her right. Finally come Melpomene and Thalia. Melpomene is on an elevation which has the effect of partially grouping her with the recumbent Jove who occupies the top of the relief. Her right hand is on her hip and her head is turned upward and towards the father of the gods. Thalia, who is the last figure of this row, is on an incline and is to be conceived as engaged in dance, though the incline and the action of the figure are quite as suggestive of falling. The lyre at the feet of Melpomene must belong to Thalia. The recumbent Jupiter turns his head to his left and holds a long sceptre in his right. At the foot of the sceptre is the eagle. The idea of the composition is, apparently, that the gods are assembled about Mt. Parnassus to do honor by their presence to the poet to whom the sacrifice is being made at the base of the mountain. One figure remains to be described. It is at the right of the second row and represents a poet or rhetorician standing on a pedestal in front of a tripod and holding a roll in his hand. This figure has been variously explained. The best explanation is that given by Goethe. He supposes the figure to be a poet who, having gained a tripod as a prize in a contest in which the works and

perhaps the character of Homer were the theme, caused the relief to be executed as a species of votive tablet and introduced himself as the donor. The figure is larger in proportion than is generally the case with donors, but this size may only indicate the donor's estimate of his own importance.

Very conspicuously placed beneath the figure of Jupiter is an inscription surrounded with such a border as often occurs on votive tablets of the Roman period. The inscription sets forth that Archelaos, the son of Apollonios of Priene, is the artist. Though the time of this artist is unknown there are many peculiarities in the relief which help to define the date of its execution. In the first place the artist did not belong to the period of creative art; for many of the figures are borrowed. The Polyhymnia and the Apollo are copied from types that frequently recur. Though such an employment of types may occasionally occur in a good art period there are other things here that make their employment conclusive. The relief betrays studied reflection. There are more evidences of thinking than of artistic working. The artist had not the power to characterize his allegorical figures by form alone. He was obliged to inscribe names to introduce them. He shows the poverty of his invention by the repetition of gestures. Comedy, Tragedy, and others, all extend the arms at the same angle. The thick gathering of drapery about the legs is another evidence of a late period: again, in Greek relief of a good period the background is plain and the representation of actuality is shunned; while here, as is customary in Roman relief, mountains and streams are given in a manner more appropriate to painting than to sculpture. For all these reasons the work can not be earlier than the early years of the Roman empire.

THE VASE OF SOSIBIOS.

163. A marble amphora about two feet high; formerly of the Borghese collection, now in the Louvre. The

relief, which has made this little marble celebrated is on the bowl of the vase.

Though individual figures are easily recognized the meaning of the whole composition is obscure. In the centre is a flaming altar. Diana stands on the left of it with her bow and stag, while a bearded and very archaic Mercury approaches on the right. Diana is accompanied by two bacchantes between whom is a satyr; and Mercury, also by two bacchantes between whom is a corybant, a personage whose presence is frequently recognized at Bacchic festivals. The last figure on each side turns away from the centre. The composition is improved by this arrangement as a central point is formed on the other side of the vase. No one of the figures of the relief is an original conception. The divinities are all repetitions of archaic types, and the other figures are also of early pattern. This mingling, which is indicative of corrupted taste, is characteristic of the time of the early Roman empire. The artist, Sosibios of Athens, who has inscribed his name on the altar, cannot have lived before the last century preceding the Christian era.¹

JUPITER, JUNO AND THETIS.

164. [A small marble relief formerly in the Academy of the Fine Arts at Turin; in the Louvre since the time of the first Napoleon. It represents a scene from the first book of the Iliad, the prayer of Thetis to Jupiter. Jupiter is seated in the centre with the peplos wrapped about his loins. He holds the sceptre in his right hand and turns his person to the left. His left hand rests on the rock on which he is seated. Thetis, nude to the waist like the god himself and with the peplos wrapped about her loins, stands by his left side. She rests her right arm on Jupiter's left shoulder and turns to him with atti-

¹ The figures are executed with great delicacy; and though no originality of composition appears, the mind does not miss it and is satisfied with the grace and fineness of the lines.

tude and expression of familiarity and confidence. Her feet are crossed, showing still further that her request has been granted and that a pleasant intimacy has taken the place of apprehension and fear. On the left is Juno, undoubtedly unperceived by the twain, in full regal attire. In her left she holds her sceptre parallel to Jupiter's; and with her right she lifts her veil to the proper height of archaic dignity and stiffness. The figure of Thetis occurs elsewhere, and the figure of Juno is but a repetition from archaic relief. This combining and commingling of styles points to the time of the early Roman empire. But the artist whose name is inscribed on the work must have entered into and fully appreciated the fun of Greek mythology. The contrast between the stately Juno and the free and easy pair is delightful. She is close upon them, and they are still entirely unconscious of her presence. One can almost hear the wrathful indignation with which she will make herself apparent and interrupt the interview. This little relief is one of the gems of Greek sculpture, and one whose teachings should be heeded if it be desired to appreciate the more enjoyable part of the manifestations of Greek intellect. — *Ed.*]

THE BARBERINI CANDELABRA.

165. Two magnificent candelabra discovered during the seventeenth century in the ruins of Hadrian's Villa. They were for over a hundred years in the possession of the Barberini family and are now in the Vatican. No works of art illustrate more admirably the magnificence of the time of Hadrian when art if deficient in originality of conception was administered to by a rich and lavish prodigality.

They are each about ten feet high, one being a few inches higher than the other. The base of each is a three-sided altar on each side of which is a representation of a divinity in exquisitely fine relief. On one candelabrum are Jupiter, Juno, and Mercury; on the other

Minerva, Mars, and Venus. Jupiter is represented nude with the exception of a mantle that falls off the left shoulder. He is standing upright and facing the left. In his left hand is the sceptre ; and in his right, which hangs down by his side, is the thunderbolt. His hair, which is long and streams down on his shoulders, is bound by a fillet. His face is mild but dignified. The head differs from all other representations of the god. Juno is very fully draped and faces her liege lord. She has a sceptre in her right hand, and with the left holds her mantle. Her attitude and expression are ordinary. Mercury is nude with the exception of a mantle that goes about his neck and falls in front and behind him. In his right hand he bears aloft the sacrificial cup, and his left is on the head of a ram that bounds by his side. Mercury is on a pedestal to make his height correspond with that of the other divinities. Of the figures on the other candelabrum, Minerva is executed with great nicety and elaborateness of detail. On her helm is a sphinx ; and on each side of it a Pegasus. A huge serpent winds itself about her and drinks from a cup she holds. The ægis is seen to fall very singularly behind her back as she advances to the left. Mars faces the left and is nude with the exception of his helmet and a slight mantle which passes about his shoulders and over his left arm. His face is in profile, and his back is turned toward the spectator. He holds a spear in his left hand, and his right is on his hip. The helmet is adorned with lions and griffins ; the lions indicating that the work is of the Roman period. Venus is the archaic Venus holding the pomegranate with one hand and her garment with the other. The garments are held out behind, and they flutter from the right shoulder as if the figure were in motion, though the feet are together and indicate repose. The original figure may have been represented gliding without motion, an action seen in many archaic statues.

The shafts of these two candelabra are of the richest of Corinthian acanthus leaves, and easily betray the Roman period by the fullness and the elaborateness of

the workmanship. The helmets of Minerva and Mars are chiselled with the carefulness of gems. It would be difficult to conceive of more magnificent works of decorative art.

THE JUPITER ALTAR OF THE CAPITOL.

166. [An interesting altar formerly in the Villa Savelli-Paolucci at Albano, now in the Museum of the Capitol at Rome.

It has been very much injured and parts are wanting. On one side all that remains is the figure of a recumbent woman. She reclines on her right arm and side. Her left arm and her breast are bare. A veil falls from her head, covers her right arm, and seems to unite with the mantle which clothes her person from below the breasts. Her left arm is raised as if indicating or complaining. The upper part of this side of the altar has entirely disappeared. The figure may be Rhea complaining of her sad fate in the destruction of her children.

The next side presents Saturn seated and receiving the stone wrapped in swaddling-clothes presented to him by Rhea instead of her youngest son, Jupiter. Rhea is fully clothed and veiled. Saturn is also veiled and is clothed from the loins. He receives the bundle with his right hand and removes the veil from his face with his left with an expression of eagerness. The fact that in this relief Rhea is fully clothed is an argument against the figure in the first relief being the same personage; besides, in the first relief the figure has curls falling on each side of the face.

On the third side a diminutive Jupiter in the background is being nourished by a goat. In the foreground are two Corybantes dancing and striking their shields with their swords. To the left is a seated female crowned with a crenelated diadem. It is probably a figurative representation of Crete. The remaining side has also been much damaged and quite a portion to the left has disappeared.

In the centre Jupiter sits enthroned. In his right hand, the sceptre; in his left, the thunderbolt; while beneath his throne is a globe typifying the universe over which he reigns. About him are gathered various divinities not all of whom can be made out. Juno faces him, Mercury is back of him, and Minerva is on his immediate right. The figure with curls near Juno may be Apollo, and the figure whose head appears just above that of Mercury may be Vulcan. With the exception of Jupiter all the figures are standing. There are ten heads in the relief and the lost portion may have had two more to complete the twelve. No particular event is represented, but the scene shows the complete sovereignty of Jupiter in contrast to the perils of his infancy. The reliefs, especially the last one, are executed with skill and care. The last one, moreover, shows a solemn and religious character worthy of the best periods of art. The workmanship and the composition are undoubtedly Roman. — *Ed.*]

THE CORYBANTES OF THE VATICAN.

167. [A frieze about eight feet long and three feet high discovered near Palestrina, about twenty-five miles east of Rome, and supposed to be of the time of the Emperor Hadrian. It represents six nude youth engaged in a warlike dance. Such dances were held in commemoration of the Corybantes, or priests of Cybele, who by the clashing of their arms prevented Saturn from hearing the cries of the infant Jupiter. Each figure is armed with helmet and shield, and each is in precisely the same position. The shield is held forward by the left arm, while the right hand is drawn back as if it held a sword and were about to strike. The figures are on their toes and seem as if in the act of turning. The four figures in the centre are in two facing pairs, while the outer figures face outwards. One can perceive that the next instant the arrangement will be changed; that the two central figures will face, and that a facing pair will be on each

side of them. The figures are admirably spaced and are executed with great skill and delicacy. The attitudes are graceful and the sense of motion is well conveyed. — *Ed.*]

ANTINOUS.

168. [Antinous, the favorite of the Emperor Hadrian, was drowned in the Nile A.D. 122, or 132. He either committed suicide from shame at the life he was leading, or he sacrificed himself to avert a threatened evil from the emperor. After his death Hadrian had countless statues erected to his memory. A city near to where he was drowned was called by his name. He was worshipped as a god, and temples were erected to him in both Egypt and Greece. It may almost be said that his death caused a new era in art; for the Antinous statues differ from everything that precedes and are of a style that has not been copied. The word style is perhaps not appropriate as the statues are undoubtedly literal renderings of the form and features of the youth. The forehead is low, broad and prominent. The hair, thick and curly. The eyes, deep set and partially closed. The nose, long and straight. The upper lip, very short. Cheeks and chin, full and round. The chest is very full; but the limbs are soft and effeminate. The expression of the face is disagreeable. It is more sullen than sad; more morose than unhappy. Up to the beginning of the present century about thirty representations of Antinous had been catalogued and described, and others have been subsequently discovered. The best known is the colossal of the Vatican, found during the last century at Palestrina by Gavin Hamilton, which represents Antinous as Bacchus. When found the statue was entirely nude; but there are indications on it of the existence of a garment of bronze, very likely a nebris. The present garment is marble.

A bust in the Louvre, called the Mondragone bust, is chiefly celebrated for the praise lavished upon it by

Winckelmann. He calls it one of the most beautiful works of art in the world, and only acknowledges two works to be superior; the Apollo Belvedere and the Laocoon. Such praise is characteristic of a man who allowed himself to be inspired by his own writing and to be misled by his own enthusiasm. — *Ed.*]

THE FUNERAL RITES OF ANTINOUS.

169. [A singular group formerly belonging to the Queen of Sweden; brought to Madrid from St. Ildefonso. It represents two naked youths standing with an altar between them and to the right and a little in the background, a small, clothed figure of a female divinity. The figure to the right stands upright and in a bold and imposing position. He holds two torches; one over the left shoulder, the other depressed on the altar. The other youth leans upon him very much in the attitude of the Apollo Sauroctonos of Praxiteles. His right hand is elevated and probably held a sacrificial cup. His left hand passes about the shoulders of the other. His head is bowed as if in sorrow.

This group has been variously explained. Müller-Wieseler call it the death of Narcissus. Narcissus looks at the stream into which he is to fall while the genius of death standing by his side is about to extinguish the torch of his life on the funeral altar. The goddess present is Venus who has come to see the completion of the punishment adjudged for slighting love. Another explanation is founded upon a supposed resemblance of the face of the youth on the left to the busts and statues of Antinous. According to this idea the little goddess is Proserpina, the goddess of the lower world, and the genius of death is about to illumine the fires for the funeral rites. The fact that Antinous holds a sacrificial cup is to show that his death is voluntary, and that he himself takes part in his own sacrifice. The group is admirably composed and well executed. The contrast between the strong upright

figure of the genius of death and the stooping figure of the hesitating Antinous is so managed that the forms of the two contrast in attractive and well balanced harmony. This is one of the best specimens of the art of the time of Hadrian. — *Ed.*]

THE VATICAN BUST OF SERAPIS.

170. The Alexandrian god Serapis is not the product of a pure and simple god-idea, but the result of the mixing of several god-ideas. The Jupiter type is the base of the conception ; but this simple type is so blended with gentleness and so pervaded with melancholy that all of Jove's force and dignity disappear. The arrangement of the hair is a marked departure from the type. Instead of rising from the forehead it covers it like a veil, producing an expression of secrecy and mystery. This expression suggests the god of the lower world who is further suggested by the modius of which the base is here indicated and which typifies fertility and abundance. The god of the lower world is further indicated by the garments about the shoulders ; for Jupiter is generally nude to the waist. In the fillet about the head may be seen the traces of seven metallic ornaments which represented sunbeams ; for Serapis was also confounded with Helios, the sun-god, and often bore his name.

The inferior art of the Roman period is seen in the minute execution of the hair, and especially in the manner in which the hair is hollowed out about the forehead. In earlier and better art the hair would have been executed broadly, and would have met the brow easily and naturally.

THE BACCHUS AND THE VINE OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

171. [A small marble group found about eight miles from Rome on the road to Florence ; obtained for the Towneley collection and transferred with it to the British Museum.

The group represents Bacchus standing by the side of a large vine stock from which emerges a small figure, decorated with vine-leaves and grape-clusters, which offers Bacchus a bunch of grapes. At the foot of the stock is a small panther. Bacchus himself is crowned with ivy. He holds a drinking-cup in his right hand which, with the arm, is modern, and passes the left lovingly about the little figure. English critics call the small figure Ampelus. Friederichs states that the figure is female and that it is the vine personified. The original right hand of Bacchus was probably extended to receive the cluster. This arrangement would be an argument for the English critics; showing that Bacchus was at the time unacquainted with the vine which, according to one tradition, resulted from the metamorphosis of Ampelus. The English critics claim moreover that the novelty of the vine is indicated by the fact that Bacchus is crowned with ivy and not with vine-leaves. The art student will be more interested in the delicate beauty of the forms than in the differences of the critics. As no such composition occurs in Greek art of the best period Friederichs assigns the work to the time of the Roman Empire. It is hard to believe that such beauty, even if it border on the effeminate, be the product of any but the best period of Greek art. A singular detail is that a species of collar formed of the leaves and the fruit of the ivy surrounds the neck of the little panther; showing that he too is having his first taste of grapes. — *Ed.*]

THE VISIT OF BACCHUS TO ICARUS.

172. [A relief, of which there are several known repetitions. According to the story Bacchus, on his return from India, was received and entertained in Attica by Icarus and his daughter Erigone. In return for the hospitality he revealed to Icarus the secret of the manufacture of wine. Icarus gave wine to the Attic shepherds. They,

intoxicated, and supposing that they had been poisoned, killed Icarus. Erigone was conducted by the faithful dog Mœra to the spot where the body of her father lay. Overcome by grief she killed herself; the affliction proved equally fatal to the dog, and Bacchus translated the three to heaven. Icarus becomes the constellation Bootes; Erigone, Virgo; and Mœra, Canicula or the dog star.

The scene represented in the reliefs is the reception of Bacchus. Reclining on a couch and semi-nude is Icarus; by his side is his daughter, and with them is sometimes a third figure who may be the daughter's nurse or companion. In front of them is a three-legged table on which are viands, etc., etc. To the right, Bacchus and his companions enter upon the scene. Bacchus is the bearded or Indian Bacchus. He is of ample proportions, and is fully clothed. A diminutive faun removes his sandals; another supports his elbow. Then comes a naked dancing-faun bearing a large thyrsus; then a Silenus playing on two pipes; then another faun, and finally another Silenus supporting an intoxicated bacchante. All the figures do not appear on all the reliefs. In the British Museum example, for instance, Erigone and the maid are absent; and of the intoxicated bacchante, there is only part of one leg and some of the drapery. Back of the principal figure is a curtain attached to a house, the house itself forming the background of the scene. The house is interesting as an example of the domestic architecture of the period. The tiles are like modern tiles, and not like those discovered at Pompeii. The windows are openings in the walls near the roof. In some of the examples a little faun is seen hanging the roof with garlands. The whole scene is picturesque and attractive, and perhaps may assist the mind to an understanding of the art of composition in painting as it existed during the best periods of Greek art; for the scene is so picturesque that the original work must have been a picture, or the original composition suggested by a painter.

The best representation of the bearded or Indian Bacchus is in the room of the biga in the Vatican, and is known as Sardanapalus. It was found in 1761 near Monte Porzio, where the villa of L. Verus is supposed to have stood. The statue is of grand proportions and of majestic impression. The mouth is open as if in speech. The right hand is raised as in address; while the left is entirely hidden beneath the voluminous outer garment which wraps the whole figure down to below the knees. The Indian Bacchus was the result of an effort of Greek imagination to clothe the idea of the effete monarchs of the East with the imposing majesty of their own Zeus. — *Ed.*]

CUPIDS.

173. [During the Roman period a fashion existed of representing Cupids in a variety of actions, especially in those where an amusing contrast to their size and apparent age would be produced. One of the best specimens is in the church of San. Vitale at Ravenna. It shows a bevy of Cupids in a temple of Neptune engaged in arranging his throne and in laying out his insignia upon it. Cupids taking part in the sports of the stadium is a frequent subject. A frieze in the Vatican represents a Cupid driving two wild boars. A beautiful group in the Naples Museum represents a Cupid with his legs in the air and on the back of a dolphin which sportively twists his tail about the boy's body. This group undoubtedly occupied the centre of a fountain where the composition would not appear so singular. Cupids disguised as Hercules; Cupids playing with wild beasts; Cupids asleep; Cupids safely tied up, and Cupids in the midst of every possible mischief, occur in numbers. They are assigned to the Roman period, though some of the conceptions are earlier as has been seen in the case of the Cupid attributed to the time of Praxiteles who is stringing the bow of Hercules. — *Ed.*]

THE BRONZE HEcate OF THE CAPITOL.

174. [A small triple group, formerly in the Chigi Palace, now in the Capitol at Rome. The figures are distinct, except at the waist, and face away from a common centre. They all hold attributes, one in each hand. One has a knife in the right hand and part of a snake in the left. She wears a Phrygian cap with rays about it. The rays indicate the sun-god; the cap, Mithras; and the snake cut in twain, the power of the sun over everything that is earth-born. The figure to the right of this one holds two torches, and has on her head a crescent and above it a lotus-flower. This figure seems to connect Hecate with Isis; that is, if the small object above the crescent be indeed a lotus-flower. It may just as well be three feathers. The remaining figure has in one hand an object which critics call a key, and in the other a coil of rope. The explanation given is that the key is the key of the lower world, and that the rope is to be used in case the key prove insufficient. Friederichs maintains that such a mixing up of divine attributes could only have been produced during the Roman period. Others view this little group with reverence and regard it as derived from the statue of Hecate which Alcamenes made for the Athenians and which, according to Pausanias, stood near the temple of the winged Victory. The group would not attract attention were it not for the learned criticism it has evoked. There are but few known representations of Hecate except on coins of the Roman period from Asia Minor. One of the most singular statues found is in the library of St. Mark's at Venice. It is small and of marble and is a three-sided shaft with three figures about it in high relief who are fully draped in archaic style and move as if in dance. Near the top of the shaft are the three heads of Hecate under one basket-shaped hat. This hat, the colothos, is also worn by the two of the dancing figures which have heads; so that the figures below as

well as the heads above may belong to Hecate. The work is curious but not interesting. Hecate was of little account in Greek mythology and has consequently received but little artistic consideration. — *Ed.*]

THE DIANA OF EPHEBUS.

175. [One of Rome's experiments in religion was the worship of the Diana of Ephesus, of whom a few statues have come to light. One found in the ruins of Hadrian's Villa by Gavin Hamilton and at present in the Vatican is a good example. The goddess from the waist down is fast bound in a narrow case from the end of which her bare feet and the ends of her garments protrude. The case is divided horizontally and perpendicularly. In the front divisions are rows of animals; oxen, lions, griffins, dragons, eagles, etc., etc. On the side divisions, except the upper one, are flowers and fruit. In the upper divisions are two figures, half female and half beast. They are supposed to be the sirens. From the waist half way up to the neck are numerous breasts. The breasts below show Diana as the creator of all things; the breasts above show her as the nourisher of all created things. Her arms are sleeved and are in the attitude of adoration. Two lions on each arm seem climbing towards the shoulder. Above the breasts is a band from which hang acorns; as the early man fed on acorns. Above this is a wide half-moon-shaped band composed of fruit or flowers. This shows the power of the goddess over vegetation. In the space between this band and the neck are four signs of the zodiac, and among them dancing female figures. These figures are supposed to be the Hours and refer to the fable of Endymion. About the head is a halo and on it winged figures which bear some resemblance to the cherubim of Holy Writ. Whatever they may be they are undoubtedly intended to show that the dominion of the goddess extends throughout the universe. On her head is a tower with gates. This may represent her

dominion over the habitations of men ; it may be only to symbolize the city where her chief shrine was located. The figure is a compound of eastern imagery with western intelligence and is not, therefore, to be regarded as an attempted copy of the Diana of Ephesus, but as an adaptation of the Diana to the requirements of Roman intelligence. — *Ed.*]

ISIS.

176. [Among the many divinities whose worship was introduced into Rome during the empire no one, to judge by the number of monuments, was more popular than Isis. There are numberless statues of this goddess in the various galleries of Europe. Few of them possess artistic excellence, and all of them have many points in common. They are clothed in a long tunic reaching to the feet. When this tunic is the only garment it is very tight to the person, especially about the feet, and is gathered up in a species of knot under the breasts. There are two such figures in the Capitol at Rome which in addition have the peculiar Egyptian head-dress with its falling ends. In these statues Egyptian sculpture is imitated and there is an attempt to give life to Egyptian forms. The result is that the sombre dignity of the Egyptian is lost, and there is no compensating gain. Generally the goddess wears an over garment which is fringed and, like the tunic, is knotted under the breasts. The lotus flower or the sistrum is always present. Of this type the specimens are too numerous to be mentioned nor are any of them deserving of special attention. Perhaps the very finest Isis statue is the black basalt of the Louvre. The figure stands straight and stiff with the hands close to the thighs. It is clothed in one long garment which reaches to the bare feet and which is more full than the garment usually worn by the goddess. The hair is in fixed and regular curls of an Asiatic character. The statue has no attribute and can only be recognized as Isis by the formal and foreign character of the sculpture.

It may be a priestess of Isis ; as it is often difficult to distinguish statues of the goddess from those of her attendants. — *Ed.*]

MITHRAS.

177. [One of the very last of the divinities introduced into Rome to assist in the fight against Christianity was Mithras, the day-god of the ancient Iranians. His worship flourished in Rome during the empire and became more and more odious and obscene until it was abolished A.D. 377. There are many representations of this god in existence and all are alike.

In the midst of a grotto Mithras is seen sacrificing a bull. He is represented as a young man with curling locks, dressed in a short tunic with long sleeves which are rolled up to the elbow. A mantle floats from his shoulders. He wears trousers and moccasins. He places his left knee on the back of the fallen bull and pulls back his nose with the left hand while plunging his sword into his neck with the right.

The hemispherical grotto is the symbol of the terrestrial world. The bull represents the fertility of the earth, and his death is supposed to represent the gathering in of the harvest. On each side of this central group is a smaller figure of a youth dressed exactly like the god. One holds a torch erect ; the other holds a torch inverted. They are day and night ; or, perhaps, the two equinoxes. A dog on his hind legs laps the blood which flows from the bull's wound. The dog may represent the heat of the dog-days when the harvest is beginning to come in. A serpent glides in front and bites to signify that all of earth will partake of the harvest. A crab fastens himself to and bites the testicles of the bull. The crab, or scorpion, is the autumnal constellation and marks the time when the harvest is fully gathered and its most vital parts gleaned. There are other figures above and on top of the grotto. Three fruit trees are directly over the head of the god. To the left the sun conducts his four-horse chariot

towards the celestial regions, Lucifer preceding with a torch. On the other side the moon in her two-horse car leads down the way, Hesperus preceding with an inverted torch.

There are many repetitions of this strange work. The most interesting, but by no means the best preserved, is in the Louvre. Interesting, because up to the middle of the 16th century it stood in its original position in the grotto of Mithras which was just below the Capitol at Rome. At the beginning of the 17th century it was taken down and deposited in the square of the Capitol. It subsequently formed part of the Borghese collection and with it came to the Louvre.

These three divinities, Isis, the Diana of Ephesus, and Mithras, were the last reserves of Paganism. When they fell, Paganism fell, and the triumph of Christianity commenced. — *Ed.*]

ROMAN PORTRAIT SCULPTURE.

178. [The custom of erecting statues to public men prevailed at Rome from an early period. Pliny's statements on the subject are specific and apparently trustworthy (N.H. xxxv, 11.). That the statues of the earlier kings of which he speaks were contemporaneous portrait-statues he neither asserts nor denies. The general impression he makes is that portraiture flourished as far back as the early days of the republic, if not earlier. In 158 B.C. the Forum had become so crowded with the statues of individuals that the censors ordered all those to be removed which had not been voted by the senate or by the people. The conquest of Greece, the importation of Greek works of art, and the immigration of Greek artists, improved and extended a branch of art peculiarly in accord with Roman thought; for the Romans had faint apprehension of spiritual things and satisfied their sense of worship by revering and fearing their leaders.

Under the emperors who assumed to be divine and

whose features were therefore regarded as the manifestation of divinity the importance of portrait-sculpture increased. The portrait of an emperor must be exact in order to give an exact representation of the divinity he embodied. And as he was to be worshipped all over his dominions, each town and temple must be provided. Hence the large numbers of imperial statues which have been dug from Roman soil; their resemblance, and their realistic excellence.

Representations of a particular emperor were probably all executed during his reign; for when he ceased to reign his divinity, if not immediately abrogated, was succeeded by an antagonistic divinity anxious to disseminate itself and hostile to the memory of its predecessor.

To secure exactness imperial statues were probably all executed at Rome and sent out over the provinces. At all events they were not the product of spontaneous local love, and their technical resemblances suggest a common origin.

Next to the statues of the emperors for number are the statues of members of the imperial families; of those who were related to and connected with, the temporary divinity, and who therefore held a species of quasi-divinity of their own.

Before the days of the empire there were statues to Cicero, Pompey, Brutus, Julius Cæsar, and other warriors and statesmen; and when the empire began to wane portraiture again became general. But during the period of the greatest imperial power portraiture was limited to the members of the reigning families, or was only active at their command and by their permission. Artistic qualities of a high order are not to be expected in these works; but their intense individuality, the clearness with which character is revealed, and the excellent technique displayed, make them the most admirable realistic works that any age has produced and models for all time to the sculptor of portraits.

Portraiture naturally divides itself into two parts, the

real and the ideal ; and though in Roman portrait sculpture but little departure from the real is permitted in the treatment of face or feature, it is recognized in the treatment of dress and in the selection of attributes. Real statues were known to the Romans under the name of "simulacra iconica ;" and as this class constituted a very large majority, no corresponding term for the other division was needed or invented. Within the limits of the "simulacra iconica" but little variety was possible. The emperor might be represented as the head of the senate, clothed in the ordinary toga prætexta ; or as pontifex maximus, with the toga drawn over the head ; or freely armed, as the commander-in-chief. From the fact that in so many of these statues the head is a separate piece from the body, the bodies must have been manufactured in quantities and the heads put on to suit the existing reign ; a proof that the statues were not manufactured under imperial supervision ; for no emperor would have prepared his own trunk for his successor's head.

One of the best specimens of an emperor in his capacity as the head of the senate, "civilis habitu," or "togata," is the famed statue of Tiberius in the Louvre. The statue is full of majestic dignity, and the toga is wrapped about the person in beautiful and becoming folds.

One of the best specimens of an emperor as pontifex maximus is a statue of Augustus in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican. The toga is arranged very much as it is in the statues "civilis habitu" except that it passes over the head. The effect is not pleasing, as it gives the head an effeminate appearance. In this statue, also, it may be seen that any other head could be substituted for the head of Augustus. The very finest statue of an emperor as commander-in-chief is also in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican and is also of Augustus. It was found in 1863 in Rome not far from the Porta del Popolo and is known to be of the year 17 B.C. Another capital example is a statue of Tiberius in the Louvre. Statues of this order were also called "statuæ thoracata." They represented

the commander-in-chief in "adlocutio;" that is, as addressing his army. The right hand is raised and at times holds a spear or a sceptre; the left hangs by the side, rests on a shield, or holds a sword. When the "statua thoracata" holds a spear or a sceptre the emperor is not in "adlocutio," but the statue is in commemoration, and generally on the pedestal will be found an indication of the victory commemorated. For instance, in the Capitol is a statue of this kind of Augustus and on the pedestal is the beak of a vessel showing that the naval victory of Actium is the theme.

Kindred with these works were the statues of emperors on horseback; or in two, four, or six-horse chariots. The equestrian statues represented the emperors going out to victory; while the chariot statues, which were always on the tops of triumphal arches, were in honor of a return from victory. Chariot statues became so common that the emperors were distinguished by having their chariots drawn by six horses, or by elephants. There are no plastic representations in existence of a chariot drawn by elephants, and it is very doubtful if any were executed. They occur on gems, however, and on reliefs. Nor are there any individual statues in existence which by their treatment indicate that they stood in chariots and could have occupied no other position. The best examples of chariot horses in existence are the bronze horses of St. Mark's in Venice. As these are undoubtedly of Greek art and of a period anterior to the Roman empire it is evident that the plastic representation of heroes in chariots is at least as early as the time of Alexander and is of Greek origin. Of equestrian statues, the statue of Marcus Aurelius standing in the piazza in front of the Capitol at Rome is the most renowned. Though defective in many details it is so satisfactory in composition and in general effect that it has served as a model for the best equestrian statues of modern times. As the lessons it teaches have been observed so the sculptor has been successful. Departures from the simplicity and purity of this work lead

to error. Herculaneum has furnished a few other examples, and in the British Museum there is a statue of the youthful Caligula which by some critics is regarded as the very best specimen extant.

Of the second class, or ideal portrait statues, there are quite as many in existence as of the first class. They divide themselves into two parts, the heroic and the divine. The heroic, where the person is represented idealized but not deified. Such statues were called by the Romans "*statuæ Achillæ*." They are generally nude and are generally copies of statues of Greek athletes. If not entirely nude, the Greek *chlamys* is substituted for the Roman toga. When the statue was equestrian, the nude was always avoided by the presence of the *chlamys*. These statues are so numerous and present so little variety that, apart from portraiture, they are of little interest. The bodies are more or less faithful copies of the statues of Greek athletes, and were probably prepared beforehand, and the heads subsequently added. Individuality of body and limbs was rarely attempted by the Roman artist. The second division under this class comprises those statues which represent the emperor deified. He is generally presented as Jupiter, whether seated or standing. When seated he has the Greek mantle about his loins and has the ordinary attributes of the Greek Zeus. The Nerva of the Vatican is a good example of the seated deified emperor, and the bronze statue of Augustus from Herculaneum in the Naples Museum is a good example of the standing deity. The portraits of women present the same variety and can be divided in the same way. The statue of Livia, recovered from Pompeii and now in the Naples Museum, is an excellent example of the fully draped standing type. An equally good example is the statue of a young girl, so called, in the Dresden collection.

In the ideal class there is a greater variety in the female than in the male statues. Women are represented as Ceres, as Diana, as a Muse, and even as Vesta. It was not till

after the time of Hadrian that the custom was introduced of attaching female portrait heads to nude statues of Venus ; a combination both ludicrous and lewd. A few portrait statues possess exceptional excellences and are described by Friederichs and by other writers. — *Ed.*]

CAMILLUS.

179. An excellently preserved bronze statue in the Capitol. Figures in a similar attitude are found on Roman reliefs representing sacrifices. The figure is that of one of the boys who acted as servants, who held the sacrificial utensils ready for the priest's use, and who served in various ways about the altar. From the position of the hands of this bronze it is evident that they originally held something ; the right, for instance, the sacrificial cup, and the left, the chalice. Only youths of distinguished families were chosen for the office of Camillus, and this youth betrays a fine aristocracy in pose and in action.

The figure is Roman ; for the occupation in which it is engaged is distinctly Roman. It must, however, belong to the best period of Roman art ; that is, to the period of the early empire. Even in antiquity it enjoyed a high reputation ; for there are many ancient copies of it. The execution is elegant and an additional charm is added by the display of an apparent carelessness in the manner in which the garments hang over the girdle. The seams on each side of the garment, and those about the sleeves are beautifully and delicately ornamented with an apparent inlaying. The shoes are similarly ornamented, and here the silver inlaying is clearly recognized.¹

THE SO-CALLED THUSNELDA.

180. A marble statue found at Rome, transported to Florence with the Medici collection, and now in the Loggia

¹ The term Camillus is of uncertain origin. Several authors use it, but no one explains it or gives its derivation. There is an excellent repetition of the figure in Naples, a bronze from Herculaneum.

de Lanzi. The left hand and the right forearm are modern. The name Thusnelda is arbitrary and is only so far correct in that the statue represents a German. The form of the shoes is strictly German. As, however, there is no trace of portraiture in the statue, the name "Germania Devicta" seems more appropriate.

The statue is worthy to be compared with the Germania of Tacitus. It is an equally beautiful recognition of the German nation by Roman intellect. The artist has depicted a virgin in the full richness of her beauty; for Germania could only be represented as a heroic virgin for whom combat had no terrors. She overshadows the women of the south and recalls the words of Tacitus when expressing astonishment at the great size of the children of the German forests. She bewails the misfortunes of her fatherland, and is so sunken in grief that she does not perceive that her unloosed dress reveals her breast. This grief, however, is full of nobility and is only the indication of intense feeling. This statue may have been occasioned by the triumphs of Germanicus, and may originally have decorated a triumphal monument.¹

THE YOUNGER AGRIPPINA OF THE NAPLES MUSEUM.

181. A marble statue which came to Naples from Rome with the Farnesi collection. The legs of the chair, the footstool with the front part of the feet which rest upon it, the nose, and the two hands, are modern. That this is the younger and not the elder Agrippina is evident

¹ Pliny (N. H. xxxvi, 41) states that an artist of the name of Coponius made, for Pompey's theatre, fourteen statues to represent the nations over which Pompey had triumphed. Some critics suppose that this work may have been one of the fourteen. The statue is impressive and interesting. It may have been the work of an artist of German origin. There is something in it so original, so different from Greek or Roman art, that perhaps one is justified in seeing in it the beginnings of a new art. The grief is so intense and so real that it seems as if no other than a German artist could have felt and expressed it.

from the features and from the style of arranging the hair ; for these peculiarities often occur on her coins.

The artist has represented the empress in old age, and has given her an expression of sadness and of painful resignation. At the same time a pure nobility has been preserved throughout. There is not, for instance, the slightest appearance of that disarrangement in the drapery which would be so natural to the representation of grief but every detail is in strict and queenly keeping.

The younger Agrippina, as history shows her, has not the charms of this statue. The fact, however, that the son for whose elevation to the throne her crimes had been committed should have been himself her murderer is pathetic and may have moved the artist to the production of this work. The painful thoughts that overspread her face may be supposed to be in apprehension of her terrible fate. The statue is one of the noblest portrait statues of ancient art. Few of any period can be compared with it.

THE ELDER AGRIPPINA OF THE CAPITOL.

182. [An equally celebrated statue is that of the elder Agrippina of the Capitol. The two in pose bear a great resemblance to one another. They are both seated at about the same angle. In each the feet are thrown out and the head and shoulders thrown back ; so that the figures seem rather reclining than seated. In the Naples figure the arms are folded and rest on the lap. In the Capitol figure the left arm is gracefully thrown over the back of the chair. The two are clothed alike, but the mantles or outer garments are differently arranged. The Capitol figure is not so well finished. The back of the head is hardly more than blocked out, and parts of the drapery are quite unfinished. The head, as is usual with imperial statues, is of another piece. The idea is thus conveyed that even this impressive statue may have been prepared for the receipt of any head, and may have served for more than one. The face has not the beauty or the

character of the Naples statue. The back of the head is shapeless and the neck is without anatomical detail. The pose is so beautiful and the drapery so admirably massed that these excellences were probably copied or borrowed from some Greek original. The commonplace head with its unattractive features detracts from the impression. There is in Florence a similar statue in which, however, the body is more upright and the head turns to the right. Another one is in the Villa Albani. In the Albani statue the same general type is preserved, but there are no evidences of copying. — *Ed.*]

THE SO-CALLED CLYTIE OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

183. A marble bust, formerly of the Towneley collection. It was purchased in Naples of the Laurenzano family, in whose possession it had been for many centuries. The name Clytie is derived from the garland from which the bust springs; for its leaves resemble those of the sunflower, the flower into which, according to Ovid, Clytie was changed. The face, however, is individual and a portrait; nor has the garland any special reference. It only serves as a beautiful connection between the bust and the pedestal; the bust rising as a flower from the flowers that are about it. The same motive is found on other busts. It occurs more frequently on the legs of chairs and tables. Below will be the foot of an animal; above, its head or a human head; and the two will be connected by a garland. Such arrangements are also found depicted on ancient vases.¹

¹ There are in the Dresden collection three portrait statues of the Roman period which are interesting as specimens and also by reason of the circumstances of their discovery. They are supposed to represent a mother and her two daughters. The statue of the mother is nearly seven feet high, and wears the toga drawn over her head. The daughters are nearly six feet high, and differ from the mother both in size and in having the head uncovered. The figures are thickly and richly draped, and after the manner of Greek statues. The statues present different degrees of excellence in execution. The mother is

MARBLES AND BRONZES FROM HERCULANEUM AND POMPEII.

184. [The many marbles and bronzes dug up from Herculaneum and Pompeii are by Friederichs and some

the best, while one of the daughters is very poor. The works were first known as vestal virgins, but as knowledge of sculpture improved it was recognized that they belonged to portrait sculptures of the Roman periods. A variety of names have been claimed for them, but their personality remains unknown.

In 1706, Prince d'Elbœuf of Lorraine was in the service of Charles VI, king of the two Sicilies. He built himself a house back of Portici on a spot known from its shape as "*granatiello*," the little pomegranate. In digging the cistern pieces of marble were found. Excavating was continued and a number of statues came to light, among them the three Dresden statues. It was this digging that led to the discovery of the buried city of Herculaneum.

A singular statue of this same character is in the Louvre. It represents a young woman holding the toga with the right hand and apparently throwing an end of it over the right shoulder. The right arm is bare from below the shoulder. The face is pleasing and the drapery is executed with elegance. A singular peculiarity of the statue is that the right foot is not indicated. The statue is about four feet and a half high, is of Pentelic marble, and was found in Rome at about the end of the last century.

It would be impossible in a work of this character to mention even all the busts and statues of historic personages of the empire and of the periods preceding it. Of the busts that claim authenticity, the bust of Hannibal in the Glyptothek at Munich is one of the oldest. (No. 154 in Brunn's catalogue). It is ugly; the features are irregular, and one eye is not only smaller than the other but is out of shape. Brunn doubts its authenticity, but it has a most striking air of originality and personality. There are several busts of Scipio Africanus and of Seneca. The best specimens are in the Naples Museum. The busts of Seneca are repulsive. With coarse features, ragged beard, and unkempt hair, the impression made is that the artist must have been in the ranks of his subject's enemies. The best bust of Julius Cæsar is in the British Museum; of Cicero, in Madrid. The youthful Augustus of the Vatican is a gem of art. His "*statua thoracata*" already referred to is the most sumptuous of imperial monuments. Of all the early emperors the representations are numberless. None more interesting and instructive than the series of Nero; for they show him from his beautiful and pure youth to the very verge of the retribution for his criminal debaucheries and his filthy crimes. His bust in the Louvre, which must have been taken but a short time before the termination of the matricide's career, has no equal for a picture of degraded humanity. His life and the character of the times in which he lived can be better told by his plastic images than by the pages of

other writers classified together because, with a few exceptions, there seems as yet no better way of classifying them. Nearly all of these works are in the Naples Museum.

In 63 A.D. Pompeii and the surrounding country were visited by an earthquake which destroyed a large part of the city and laid waste the country. For some time after the Roman Senate debated whether the inhabitants who had escaped should be allowed to return and rebuild their houses and their temples. Permission was finally accorded and portions of the city were reconstructed. The total destruction of Pompeii occurred 79 A.D., and it is reasonable to suppose that the major part of the works of art found in the ruins in the town were produced between the two dates; for many of the inhabitants did not return and kept their works of art with them; while the older and more valuable of the public statues were probably removed to a place of greater safety, as the memory of the first calamity reached to the second. Among the temples rebuilt was the temple of Isis. On its site have been found statues which are of too poor a workmanship to be attributable to a good school and which, therefore, may be regarded as specimens of Pompeian art of the period in question. In all probability they are also specimens of local art; for after the earthquake Pompeii was not in a position to employ foreign artists. One of these statues is a Bacchus and may be taken as a representative of the class. The god is nude, with the exception of the nebris, and is standing. The nebris is fastened over the right shoulder and under the left arm. The right hand is raised as if holding the thyrsus, or a wine-cup; while the left hangs by the side. On the feet are ornamented sandals with high tops. By

history. The statues of all the emperors are full of character. No study of the times can be complete which does not contain a full examination of these most interesting and instructive works of art. They show as clearly the practical life of the Romans as the works of Phidias and Praxiteles show the ideal life of the Greeks. — *Ed.*]

his side is a small panther. On the pedestal is the inscription "N. Popidius Ampliatus P.S." The statue is entirely without grace or character and is, moreover, very carelessly executed. Yet it is in no way inferior to all the Pompeiian marbles and bronzes of similar origin. A small Venus found near the temple of Venus is equally destitute of artistic attractions. She is nude and in the conventional position, while between her legs is held a bit of drapery. These and similar statues are specimens of late Pompeiian original art and are sad evidences of the degradation into which the arts had fallen.

Of a different origin are the figures that adorned fountains; gods, nymphs, and satyrs, in a variety of actions and with various attributes. Some of these are probably earlier than the earthquake, and were not removed because they were fastened to the architecture. Of this fountain sculpture is the celebrated group of

HERCULES AND THE HIND.

185. Found in 1805 in the so-called House of Sallust by the side of the impluvium. It is now in the Museum of Palermo. The hind has been overtaken and falls to the ground. The hero presses it down with the left knee, while with his two hands he seems to be tearing its horns asunder. Though a hind, horns are added for the sake of beauty. In the animal's mouth is still seen the pipe through which water was supplied to the fountain. The group is admirable in composition and in execution. It typifies a class of works of which Pompeii continues to furnish examples; that is, works by artists who, acknowledging their poverty of conception, employed their talents in adapting the motives of elder artists to their own purposes. The subject of Hercules and the hind is one of the earliest in art. It occurs both in the round and the relief. One of the earliest examples is the archaic relief in the British Museum. Another example is on an altar in the Museum of the Capitol; another on a

vase in the Villa Albani, and still another on a relief found at Praeneste and now in the Vatican (Visconti, P. C. iv, 40). It is difficult to conceive that this masterly work originated at the same time with the works already mentioned. It is easier to conclude that it is one of those which escaped the earthquake and remained *in situ*; or that it was executed in Rome, or somewhere else outside Pompeii, where the best of Greek artists were to be found.

THE FISHERMAN.

186. A singular specimen of fountain sculpture is the bronze fisherman. The figure has plebeian features, is clothed as a daily workman, and is seated in a posture of true fishing expectancy. In his left hand he holds a basket of fish already caught, and in his outstretched right must be imagined his rod. The countenance is expressive, and the jerking up of the hand holding the basket in sympathy with the other shows that the fisherman has just had a bite. On the rock or stump on which he is seated is a mask and from it flowed the water.

This entertaining bronze was found in 1827 in a private Pompeian house and on the edge of a basin.

THE DANCING FAUN.

187. Another Pompeian bronze, and one of the most excellent of antiquity. It is regarded by Overbeck and other critics as having been in some way connected with a fountain. It was found in 1831 in the house now known as the House of the Faun, and is one of the gems of the Naples collection. The faun is dancing on his toes and snapping his fingers in the air with glee. Overbeck says of it: "There are few works of art that present so admirably the unbridled wantonness of Bacchanalian revelry as the statue of this sinewy old man who, full of motion and elasticity, dances along as if there were no such thing as weight to his body, and as if the

extreme tension of every muscle only added to his joy and his comfort. The spirit of his god exalts and impels him till he forgets himself, the world, and all there is therein. On the other hand the artist has well thought out how to show that the muscles really labor; that here there is no lazy movement, no dust-brush action; but that the limbs move with force as well as with quickness." With his little horns and his whisking tail, art has afforded no jollier picture of the go and swing of full animal life. The conception of this little figure is so pure, and the execution not only so admirably carries out the conception, but it is so superlatively excellent in every detail that the work might be attributed to Praxiteles, if Praxiteles had ever divested himself of his sorrow. It must be attributed to some great artist who had the faculty of enjoying all good things to the fullest, and who would make others as happy as he was himself. Art presents no better antidote to melancholy. In the study of the uninteresting art of the period it is delightful to find a work that can be appreciated without effort. Though the head is elderly there is nothing in the body to indicate age. The forms are not the youthful forms of an Apollo Saurroctonos for instance; but with a certain age they have the appearance of a perfected and a permanent manly development. There is a singular suggestion of permanence. Having reached perfection, perfection will be maintained. I know of no statue of antiquity in which the notion of continuing and changeless beauty is so clearly rendered.

THE SERVING SILENUS.

188. Is another equally enjoyable work. It represents an elderly Silenus who has been condemned to hold up over his head the support of an utensil. The ring forming the support is of the body of a snake. Its head comes down about the left arm of the Silenus; while its tail turns up in the air at the opposite side. The Silenus is crowned with the leaves and clusters of the vine; has

thick and bushy beard, and is girt about the loins with a cloth suggestive of a blacksmith's apron. The association of a Silenus with extreme labor is sufficiently comical in itself for *genre*. Here the execution carries out the idea in such a manner as to make the work truly artistic. The feet are far apart to make the supporting power greater; a distinct effort accompanies the raising of the left arm; the head bows down to the right with this effort, while the right arm is stretched out from the person as if to counterbalance the supported weight.

THE SHOOTING APOLLO.

189. The god is nude with the exception of a species of shawl which passes over the back and around each arm from the inside out. The arms are in the attitude of shooting. The statue was found near the Forum in 1817; but a hand, a foot, and an arm, were wanting. These were found over a year afterwards in quite another part of the city. The statue is unattractive and only noticeable because it has been the subject of so much controversy; Welcker and Friederichs comparing it with a Diana found about the same time and claiming that the two were by the same hand and must have formed part of a Niobe group. This Overbeck stoutly denies. He also claims to see in the Apollo a certain degree of beauty.

THE SEATED MERCURY.

190. The god is entirely nude and is represented seated on a rock. The body is slightly bent, the left elbow resting on the left knee. The right leg is stretched out, and the right hand rests on the rock on which he is seated. After the delivery of one message the god is resting before he starts with another. The motive is often found on gems and on reliefs. Winckelmann calls attention to the manner in which the sandals are fastened. The

buckle where the straps meet is directly under the sole of the foot; showing, according to Winckelmann, that the god did not walk but fly. The attitude is graceful, but the forms are hard and the anatomy is not carried out. All the back part of the head is modern.

THE NARCISSUS.

191. Exhumed in 1862 on the "Vico del Balcone Pensile;" now in the Naples Museum. The most beautiful of all the Pompeiian bronzes. In fact no more beautiful bronze has been recovered from antiquity. The bronze represents a youth who is nude with the exception of a small nebris which passes over the left shoulder and about the left wrist. The left hand is on the hip in such a way that the back of the forefinger rests against the hip while the little finger and thumb are extended. The right arm is near the body to the elbow. The right forearm is at right angles to the body. The forefinger of the right hand is extended, and the head is bent down to the left, while the glance is directed to the right. The name of the statue and the motive of the action are in dispute. Narcissus is the name generally accepted, and he is supposed to be listening to Echo, or to be regarding himself in a spring at his feet. The action of the left hand is not without affectation and accords with the character of Narcissus. On the other hand the nebris characterizes a faun and the action can be understood if a panther be imagined playing by the side of the faun, and being instructed or restrained by the admonition of the forefinger of the right hand. The figure is one of the most elegant of antiquity and is modelled with a perfection of execution. It has, too, that suggestion of sadness which characterizes the school of Praxiteles, of which great master it is worthy. There is no other ancient bronze where the surface has so admirably preserved the appearance of the surface of flesh itself. Most of the bronzes from Hercu-

laneum and Pompeii had their surfaces seriously injured by the catastrophe; and some of them, the Seated Mercury for instance, have had their original surfaces entirely removed by injudicious repolishing.¹

¹ Many writers of the History of Classic Sculpture devote time to the consideration of the last period of Greek art when, after the reign of Hadrian, there was nothing left to retard destruction, and when monuments are but evidences of disintegration and decay. Such monuments are so uninteresting that I confess my inability to discuss them. It is sufficient of a labor to attempt to describe the few works of the Roman period that are faintly artistic. Art must not be confounded with archæology. The critical sense may be interested in classifying works that are ugly and that repel; but their examination cannot fail to dull artistic sense. In all artistic studies let the artistic sense be kept pure and active, and let it not be forced into contact with works that cannot give pleasure. The Romans were as destitute of appreciation of the beautiful as are the Anglo-Saxons. When the nationality of the Greeks had disappeared, art had no true life till the era of Gothic architecture. Even Christian sculpture of the early centuries is base, imitative, and shows no elements of the faith it pretended to illustrate.

INDEX.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

Abbreviations used in the Index.

B., Berlin. — *B.M.*, British Museum, London. — *C.*, Capitol, Rome. — *G.*, Glyptothek, Munich. — *J.P.*, Japanese Palace, Dresden. — *L.*, Louvre, Paris. — *M.N.*, Museo Nazionale, Naples. — *U.*, Uffizi, Florence. — *V.*, Vatican, Rome. — *V.A.*, Villa Albani, Rome. — *V.B.*, Villa Borghese, Rome. — *V.L.*, Villa Ludovisi, Rome. — *et al.*, et alibi.

Name.	Place.	No.
Adorant	B.	84
Ægina, marbles of	G.	14
Æsop, bust	V. A.	93
Agrippina, the younger	M. N.	181
“ “ elder	C.	182
Alexander, dying	U.	145
Altar, twelve gods	L.	28
Amazon, Phidian	V. et C.	34
“ of Kresilas	V.	35
“ of Polcyleitus	V.	36
“ Vienna fragment	11
Antinous, so called	V.	65
“	L. et al.	168
“ funeral rites of	Madrid.	169
Antiochia	V.	146
Apollo, of Thera	Athens	1
“ of Tenea	G.	1
“ Sauroktonos	V. A., V. et L.	72
“ Belvedere	V.	129
“ and Hercules	J. P.	26
“ and Victory	B. M.	25
“ Musagetes	V.	67
“ Ottoboni	V.	158
“ from Pompeii	M. N.	189
“ of Kanachos	B. M. et al.	15
“ Strangford	B. M.	16
“ Choiseul Gouffier	B. M.	17
Apollino	U.	75
Apoxyomenos	V.	82
Ariadne, sleeping	V. et al.	119
“ deserted	J. P.	120

Name.	Place.	No.
Aristion, tombstone	M. N.	6
Aristogeiton	M. N.	9
l'Arrotino	U.	127
Assos Reliefs	L. and Boston	2
Athlete, torso	J. P.	39
Attalus, votive statues	M. N. et al.	95
Bacchante	B. M.	122
Bacchus, torso	M. N.	64
“ youthful	C. et al.	116, 117
“ head	C.	118
“ various	M. N. et al.	121
“ and the Vine	B. M.	171
“ archaic	G.	20
“ and Icarus	B. M. et al.	172
Camillus	C. et al.	179
Candelabra, Barberini	V.	165
Caryatides, Roman	V. et al.	161
Centaur with Cupid	L. et al.	108
Ceres	V.	141
“ of Cnidus	B. M.	58
Charioteer, archaic	Athens	5
Clytie, bust	B. M.	183
Colossals of Monte Cavallo	Rome	48
Corybantes	V.	167
Cupid, of Praxiteles	V.	78
“ Elgin	B. M.	74
“ with bow of Hercules	C.	107
Cupids, Roman	V. et al.	173
Cupid and Psyche	C. et al.	109
Demosthenes	V.	91
Diadumenos	B. M.	38
Diana, Pompeiiian	M. N.	18
“ pseud-archaic	G.	21
“ of Versailles	L.	129a
“ of Gabii	L.	140
“ of Ephesus	V.	175
Diogenes	V. A.	92
Discobolos, of Myron	V. et al.	40
“ reflecting	V.	83
Doryphoros	M. N.	87
Eirēne and Plutos, child	G.	54
Eleusinian divinities	Athens	46
Endymion	Stockholm	152
Erechtheum, sculpture of	Athens	49
Euripides and Sophocles	Bonn	88
Farnese Bull	M. N.	94

Name.	Place.	No.
Farnese Flora	M. N.	115
Faun, of Praxiteles	C. et al.	76
“ Barberini	G.	124
“ dancing, from Pompeii	M. N.	187
Fisherman	M. N.	186
Funereal sculpture	Athens et al.	51
Ganymede, various	U. et al.	111, 112
“ of Leochares	V.	80
Gaul, “ Dying Gladiator”	C.	96
“ dying, with wife	V. L.	97
Genius of eternal repose	L. et V.	153
Germanicus	L.	144
Gladiator, Borghese	L.	138
Graces	L. et al.	113
Harmodius	M. N.	9
Harpy Monument	B. M.	12
Hecate	C.	174
Hercules, Farnese	M. N.	134
“ torso Belvidere	V.	135
“ with hind	Palermo	185
“ “ archaic	B. M.	8
Hermaphrodite	L. et al.	114
Hermes, veiled	B.	159
“ decoration of a	G.	147
Homer, bust	B. M. et al.	90
“ apotheosis of	B. M.	162
Isis	L. et al.	176
Jason	L. et al.	130
Juno, Farnese	M. N.	32
“ bust	V. L.	57
“ torso	Vienna	61
“ later, Ludovisi head	V. L.	128
Jupiter, Otricoli mask	V.	62
“ Juno and Thetis	L.	164
“ altar	C.	166
Laocoon	V.	149
Leda and Swan	Athens et al.	106
Leukothea relief	V. A.	12a
Libera	B. M.	123
Lions of Mycena	Mycena	
Lysikrates, Monument of	Athens	81
Maiden, runner	V.	33
“ water-bearer	Tegel	142
Mars, seated	V. L.	63
“ Borghese	L.	151

Name.	Place.	No.
Marsyas	L. et al.	126
Mausoleum marbles	B. M.	69
Medusa Rondanini	G.	133
Meleager	V.	66
Melpomene	L.	156
Menander and Posidippos	V.	89
Mercury and infant Bacchus	Olympia	71
“ seated, from Herculaneum	M. N.	190
Minerva, fragment	J. P.	19
“ Parthenon statuette	Athens	28
“ École des Beaux Arts	Paris	29
“ Albani	V. A.	30
“ Velletri	L.	31
“ Giustiniani	V.	157
Mithras	L. et al.	177
Muses	V. et al.	68
Narcissus	M. N.	191
Naples, archaic tombstone	M. N.	7
Nemesis	V.	131
Neptune and Amphitrite	G.	59
Niké Temple, sculpture of	B. M. et al.	50
Nile	V.	150
Niobe, statues	U. et al.	55
“ sarcophagus	V., G. et al.	154
Nymph, with shell	L. et al.	143
Official reliefs	Athens et al.	53
Olympia sculpture	L. et al.	44
Orestes and Electra	V. L.	148
“ sarcophagus	V.	155
Orpheus, Eurydice, and Mercury	L. et al.	47
Panhermes	B. M.	22
Paris and Helen	M. N.	137
Parthenon sculpture	B. M. et al.	45
Pasquino	V. et al.	56
Penelope	V.	10
Pergamus sculpture	B.	98
Pericles, bust	B. M.	42
Phigalia sculpture	B. M.	48
Phocion	V.	86
Pompeiiian sculpture	M. N.	184
Pozzuoli marine divinity	V.	160
Psyche, Capua fragment	M. N.	110
Roman portrait sculpture	M. N. et al.	178
“ mother and daughters	J. P.	183, n
Samothrace, relief	L.	4
Selinus, reliefs	Palermo	3

Name.	Place.	No.
Serapis, bust.	V.	170
Silenus of Myron	Lateran	41
“ with youthful Bacchus	L. et al.	78
“ dancing	V. B.	125
“ serving, from Herculaneum	M. N.	188
Sophocles	V.	87
“ and Euripides	Bonn	88
Sosibios, vase of	L.	163
Thasos reliefs	L. and Boston	13
Thorn extractor	C.	85
Thusnelda	Florence	180
Tiber	L.	150, <i>n</i>
Tripod pedestal	J. P.	26
Triton	V.	60
Vesta	“ Torlonia ”	27
Venus of Cnidus	G. et V.	70
“ of Milo	L.	77
“ crouching	V. et al.	79
“ of Capua	M. N.	99
“ of Arles	L.	100
“ Towneley	B. M.	101
“ of the Capitol	C.	102
“ Medici	U.	103
“ of Syracuse	Syracuse	104
“ Kallipygos	M. N.	105
“ torso	M. N.	105, <i>f</i>
“ “	B. M.	105, <i>f</i>
Victory of Samothrace	L.	136
“ and Bull	B. M.	132
Votive reliefs	Athens et al.	52
Wrestlers	U.	139
Well-curb	C.	24

NUMERICAL INDEX OF LOCATION.



Athens, 1, 5, 6, 28, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 81, 106.

Berlin, 84, 90, 98.

British Museum, London, 8, 12, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25, 38, 40, 42, 45, 48, 49,
50, 58, 69, 74, 90, 101, 105*f*, 122, 123, 132, 159, 162, 171, 172, 183.

Capitol, Rome, 24, 34, 76, 85, 96, 102, 107, 109, 116, 117, 118, 166,
174, 176, 179, 182.

Glyptothek, Munich, 1, 14, 20, 21, 54, 59, 70, 124, 133, 147.

Japanese Palace, Dresden, 19, 26, 39, 120, 183, *note*.

Louvre, Paris, 2, 4, 13, 23, 31, 44, 47, 72, 77, 78, 79, 100, 108, 113,
114, 126, 129*a*, 130, 136, 138, 140, 143, 144, 151, 153, 156, 163,
164, 168, 177.

Museo Nazionale, Naples, 6, 7, 9, 18, 32, 37, 47, 64, 94, 95, 99, 105,
105*f*, 110, 115, 121, 134, 137, 178, 181, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189,
190, 191.

Uffizi, Florence, 55, 75, 103, 112, 127, 139, 145.

Vatican, Rome, 10, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 56, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72,
73, 79, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 89, 91, 111, 119, 129, 131, 135, 141, 146, 149,
150, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161, 165, 167, 168, 170, 173, 175.

Villa Albani, Rome, 12*a*, 30, 47, 72, 92, 93.

Villa Borghese, Rome, 114, 125.

Villa Ludovosi, Rome, 57, 63, 97, 128, 148.

Bonn, 88.
Florence, 180 (Loggia de' Lanzi).
Madrid, 119, 169.
Palermo, 8, 185.
Paris, Ecole de Beaux Arts, 29.
Potsdam, 96.
Rome, 43 (Monte Cavallo); 41 (Lateran); 27 (Torlonia).
Stockholm, 152.
Syracuse, 104.
Tegel, 142.
Venice, 95.
Vienna, 11, 61.

Casts of many of the principal statues described in this work can be seen at the Art Museum, Boston; Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; the Peabody Institute, Baltimore, Md.; the Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.; Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.; and the Yale Art School, New Haven, Conn. These and other collections in the country are, however, so continually growing and changing that any reference to specific catalogued numbers would not long remain true.

